00094344

00094344

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018

94344
ac

MEMOIRS,

ILLUSTRATING THE

HISTORY of JACOBINISM.

A TRANSLATION FROM THE FRENCH OF

THE ABBE BARRUEL.

PART II.—VOL. II.

THE ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY T. BURTON, NO. 11, GATE-STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS,

AND SOLD BY E. BOOKER, NO. 56, NEW BOND-STREET.

1797.

[Entered at Stationer's Hall.]

PREFACE

OF THE

TRANSLATOR.

THE Second Volume of the "*Memoirs of Jacobiniſm*," containing the ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY, is preſented to the Public without the advantage which the Firſt poſſeſſed in the flattering ſanction of Mr. Burke's favorable opinion; an awful event having deprived the world of that illuſtrious writer. In the firſt of his Poſthumous Works however, we find him attributing the progreſs of the French Revolution to a Spirit of Proſelytiſm: he calls it "*A Revolution of* "*Doctrine and Theoretic Dogma*, bearing "little analogy with any of thoſe Revo-"lutions which had ever been brought "about in Europe, on principles merely "political *." Our readers will be ſurprized at the coincidence of this Work with the ideas of that eloquent Champion of Real Liberty. The very education of the Adept in Rebellion is deſcribed; the dangerous tendency of maxims which

* Thoughts on French Affairs, 1791, page 6.

have been received in their abſtract ſenſe is explained; the means employed to pervert them into principles of rebellion is demonſtrated; divers eſſays of their new doctrines delineated; and, finally, the union of men thus educated with the moſt formidable Sect of Antiquity, in the *Occult Lodges* * of Freemaſonry is illuſtrated. With ſuch a regular progreſſion, in the training of youth, with ſuch deteſtable Chiefs to lead them, what evil is there that may not be feared. Is not the public weal in danger? Is it not become a problem in the preſent ſtate of Europe ---WHETHER A SINGLE GOVERNMENT SHALL SUBSIST? Is not every State equally threatened with danger?

Should any readers have viewed with indifference the formidable though evident Conſpiracy againſt Chriſtianity, and have contented themſelves with ſaying, that it was the buſineſs of the Clergy to

* We repeat, that by OCCULT LODGES are meant thoſe LODGES which were hidden from the generality of Freemaſons themſelves. They are not the common Lodges frequented by men too honorable to be tampered with, and too much attached to their God and country to hearken to the rebellious and impious plots of the ARRIÈRES LOGES.

guard

guard againſt that; let them remember, that the ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY approaches one ſtep nearer to them—— It will rob them of their laws, and plunge them into the horrors of civil war.—— Such fears may perhaps awaken them, and ſpur them on to the ſtudy of principles fully detailed in this Volume (for it is a work of reflection and not of amuſement); and if in treating of the *Occult Lodges* of Maſonry they find horrors ſcarcely credible, let them reflect on the proofs adduced, and ſhudder at the precipice yawning beneath them. It is the duty of every ſubject to avert the impending danger. Let the parent inſtruct the child, whoſe happineſs may be endangered both in this life and the next. Let the Clergyman enlighten his flock on the perils with which it is threatened; for it is the duty he owes to his GOD and to his *Country*. Let the Magiſtrate watch over his diſtrict; for the laws call on him for his aid, and it is he that would fall the firſt victim of the popular fury. Let the honorable Maſon read and learn the abuſes to which the Lodges are expoſed,

poſed, and he will guard them againſt the impious and rebellious principles of Occult Maſonry. In fine, in appealing to the moſt incredulous, we ſhall lay before them the words of the learned and military Commentator of Polybius (*Chevalier de Folland*), who, ſpeaking of the revolt of the foreign troops againſt the Carthaginians, after many ſhrewd obſervations on Conſpiracies in general, turns his mind toward the times in which he was then writing, and as early as the year 1727, makes uſe of the following remarkable expreſſions: "A Conſpiracy "is forming at this preſent time, gradu- "ally gaining ground, and by means ſo "ſubtile, that I regret my not having "come into the world *thirty* years later "to ſee the end of it. It muſt be owned, "that certain politicians are very wiſe, "and that the glaſſes of the European "Powers are dim indeed. If ever *mathe- "matical proofs* were acquired, it is at "preſent *." May my countrymen duly reflect on, and timely profit by this hint! T.

* Hiſtoire de Polybe, Vol. II. page 329. The Chevalier de Follard died at Avignon, 1752.

CON-

CONTENTS.

Page

PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE

CHAP. I. First Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—Voltaire and D'Alembert paſſing from the Hatred of Chriſtianity to the Hatred of Kings 9

CHAP. II. Second Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—Political Syſtems of the Sect.—D'Argenſon and Monteſquieu - - 43

CHAP. III. Jean Jaques Rouſſeau's Syſtem 99

CHAP. IV. Third Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—The general Effect of the Syſtems of Monteſquieu and Jean Jaques.—Convention of the Sophiſters.—The Coalition of their Plots againſt the Throne, with their Plots againſt the Altar - - - - - 123

CHAP. V.* Fourth Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—Inundation of Antimonarchical Books.—Freſh Proofs of the Conſpiracy 159

* Has been miſprinted Chap. VI.

CHAP.

Page

CHAP. VI. Fifth Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—The Democratic Eſſay at Geneva - - - - 205

CHAP. VII. Ariſtocratical Eſſay in France 232

CHAP. VIII. Eſſay of the Sophiſters againſt Ariſtocracy - - - 249

OF MASONRY.

CHAP. IX. Of the General Secret, or Leſſer Myſteries, of Freemaſonry - - 273

CHAP. X. Of the Grand Myſteries or Secrets of the Occult Lodges - - 293

CHAP. XI. New Proofs of the Syſtem and Myſteries of the Occult Maſons - 331

CHAP. XII. Proofs of the Origin of Freemaſons drawn from their own Syſtems 359

CHAP. XIII. Farther Declarations of the Freemaſons as to their Origin.—The real Founder of Maſonry.—True and firſt Origin of their Myſteries and of all their Syſtems - - - 390

CHAP. XIV. Sixth Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.—Coalition of the Sophiſters and of the Freemaſons - - 424

THE

THE

ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY.

PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE.

IN this Second Part of the "MEMOIRS ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF JACOBINISM," our object will be to ſhow, how the *Sophiſters of Impiety*, becoming the *Sophiſters of Rebellion*, after having conſpired againſt every altar, conſpire againſt every throne. We ſhall demonſtrate, that theſe men under the name of Philoſophers, after having ſworn to cruſh Chriſt and his altars, bound themſelves in a ſecond oath to annihilate all regal power. Plan of this 2d part.

We have ſaid, in the former part of this work*, that the Sophiſters of Impiety, when they were become the Sophiſters alſo of Rebellion, had leagued with a ſect, long ſince concealed in the

* Preliminary Diſcourſe, vol. 1. p. xxii.

occult lodges of Freemaſonry, whoſe adepts, like the modern Philoſophers, had ſworn hatred to the altar and the throne, had ſworn to cruſh the God of the Chriſtians, and utterly to extirpate the Kings of the earth.

This two-fold object naturally divides our Second Volume into two Parts. The firſt will develope the riſe and progreſs of the Conſpiracy of the Sophiſters, called Philoſophers: The ſecond, of that ſect, which we have denominated Occult Maſons *(Arrières Maçons)*, to diſtinguiſh their adepts from the multitude of brethren who were too virtuous to be initiated in the occult myſteries, too religious, and too faithful citizens to aſſociate in their plots.

After having treated ſeparately of theſe two conſpiracies, though both tending to the ſame object, we ſhall ſhow them leaguing together; and by their united efforts accompliſhing that part of the French Revolution which effected the overthrow of Religion and Monarchy, of the altar and the throne; in a word, which murdered, baſely murdered, the unfortunate Lewis XVI. on a ſcaffold.

Reflexions on the conſpiracy againſt Kings.

Confining ourſelves to facts, and ſuppreſſing the powers of imagination, it ſeems incumbent on us to ſubmit ſome few reflections to the reader, which, though naturally flowing from the ſubject, are yet requiſite to enable him to follow the progreſs of the Sophiſters in their ſecond conſpiracy,

to

to ſhow by what gradations they paſſed, or rather with what celerity they were hurried headlong, from the ſchool of impiety to that of rebellion, by the inherent tendency of their principles.

While, under the direction of Voltaire, theſe pretended Philoſophers had merely applied their principles of liberty and equality to matters of faith, and had thence conſpired againſt the God of the goſpel, that each might be at liberty to form his own religion, or throw off every religious tie;—during that time, few were the obſtacles they had to fear from thoſe various claſſes of men, which it was chiefly their object to captivate.—During their war againſt Chriſtianity, the paſſions proved their moſt powerful allies. There would be no great difficulty in deluding thoſe unfortunate men. who combat the myſteries which they do not underſtand, merely to exempt themſelves from the reſtraint of thoſe precepts and the practice of thoſe virtues which are unfavourable to their paſſions.

Sovereigns, ſeldom much verſed in the ſcience or hiſtory of religion; men who often, under the ſanction of opulence and the ſplendour of rank, only ſeek to throw off all control on their moral conduct; others aſpiring at fortune, and caring not by what unwarrantable means they acquire it; vain men panting after an empty name, and ready to ſacrifice every truth to a ſar-

caſtic meteor, or ſome blaſphemy miſtaken for wit, and others who would have had little hope of celebrity had they not directed their genius againſt their God;—in ſhort, all thoſe men who, eaſily receiving ſophiſms for demonſtrative proofs, never troubled themſelves with the inveſtigation of that *equality of rights*, and that *liberty of reaſon*, which the conſpiring ſect repreſented to them as being incompatible with a religion revealed, and replete with myſteries.

Few even of the adepts had ever reflected on the abſurdity of oppoſing the rights of reaſon to revelation; as if thoſe pretended rights of our limited reaſon were to ſuſpend the power of an infinite God who reveals himſelf, or were to depreciate the truth of his oracles, and of the miſſion of his Prophets and Apoſtles. They never had reflected, that the whole queſtion of theſe rights of reaſon turned ſimply on this: to know whether God had ſpoken or not; and to believe and ſilently adore whatever might be the nature of the truths he had revealed.

Men ſo little able to comprehend and to defend the rights of their God, could not have been very dangerous adverſaries for the Sophiſters, who are perpetually ſetting this liberty of reaſon in oppoſition to the Goſpel.

But how different the caſe, when the ſect applying this ſame liberty and equality to the empire

empire of human laws and to civil ſociety, concludes, that after having cruſhed the altar, it was alſo neceſſary to overturn every throne, in order that men might be reinſtated in their original Liberty and Equality! A conſpiracy on ſuch principles, and drawing after it ſuch conſequences, muſt naturally have been combated by the intereſts and the paſſions of the Royal Sophiſters, of the protecting Princes, and of all thoſe adepts of the higher claſſes, who were ſo docile to the accents of liberty, when thoſe accents only menaced the deſtruction of the Religion of their God.

Voltaire and D'Alembert could not expect to find Frederic, Joſeph II. Catherine III. or Guſtavus of Sweden, much diſpoſed to ſubvert their reſpective thrones. It was very probable too, that many other protecting adepts, ſuch as miniſters or courtiers, nobles, or wealthy perſons diſtinguiſhed by their rank, would ſoon perceive the danger of depending on a multitude, who, having thrown off all obedience, would ſoon graſp at ſovereignty itſelf, and, as the firſt eſſay of its power, would level every ſpecies of property, and ſtrike off every head which roſe above that multitude.

On the ſide of the Sophiſters themſelves, though gratitude could have had but little weight with them, yet their intereſt, their very exiſtence might have abated their eagerneſs againſt the throne.

D'Alembert lived on penſions from the Kings of France and Pruſſia; his very apartment in the Louvre was a gift from Lewis XVI. The Empreſs of Ruſſia alone ſupported Diderot's ruined fortune; and the Grand Duke penſioned the adept La Harpe. Damilaville would have been a beggar, if diſcarded from his office. The Philoſophic Sanhedrim of that French Academy compoſed of ſo many adepts owed its exiſtence, its means, its counters *(jettons)* to the generoſity of the monarch. There were few other ſcribbling Sophiſters who did not either look up to a penſion, or had not already obtained one by the intrigues of the protecting miniſters.

Voltaire had acquired an independent fortune; but he was not, on that account, the leſs elated when M. de Choiſeul gave him back the penſion which, twelve years before, he had loſt, on account of his impious writings *. Beſide, nobody knew better than did Voltaire, that he was chiefly indebted for the ſucceſs of his Antichriſtian Conſpiracy to the royal adepts. He was too proud of numbering among his diſciples Imperial and Regal Sovereigns, to conſpire againſt their very exiſtence on earth.

All theſe motives, therefore, gave quite a different turn to the conſpiracy againſt the Throne,

* Let. to Damilaville, 9th January 1762.

from

from that which we have already ſeen erected againſt the Altar. In the warfare againſt the Goſpel, Liberty and Equality could have been but a ſhallow pretence; it was their hatred againſt Chriſt by which they were hurried away. It is hardly poſſible that they could have concealed from themſelves that it was rather a war waged by their paſſions againſt the virtues of the goſpel, than a warfare of reaſon againſt the myſteries of Chriſtianity. In the Antimonarchical Conſpiracy, the pretext had grown into conviction. The Sophiſters believed their principles of Liberty and Equality to be demonſtrated, they did not even ſuſpect an error in their principles. They believed the war which they waged againſt Kings, to be a war of juſtice and of wiſdom. In the former conſpiracy, it was the paſſions inventing principles to combat the God of the Chriſtians; in the latter, it was reaſon, miſled by thoſe ſame principles, ſeeking and glorying in the downfal of every crowned head.

Rapid had been the progreſs of the paſſions. From his very birth, Voltaire's hatred againſt Chriſt had been at its height. Scarcely had he known, ere he hated, ſcarcely hated when he ſwore to cruſh the God of the Chriſtians. Not ſuch was the progreſs of the hatred againſt Kings. This ſentiment had, like opinion and conviction, its gradations. The very intereſt of the Sophi-

ſters of Impiety thwarted for a long time the meaſures of thoſe of Rebellion; many years were neceſſary to enable the ſect to form its ſyſtems, to determine its plots, and reſolve on its object. Were we to precipitate its ſteps, we ſhould be guilty of miſrepreſentation. As faithful hiſtorians, it will be incumbent on us, to ſhow this hatred againſt Kings in its infancy, that is, ſpringing from the hatred againſt Chriſt, and ſucceſſively applying thoſe principles invented againſt the altar, to the deſtruction of the throne. This hatred againſt kings had even in the chiefs of the conſpirators its gradations: but their ſyſtems will complete the deluſion, and root it in the hearts of the adepts. It will bear abſolute ſway over their ſecret academy, and there will the ſame plots be contrived againſt the throne as Philoſophiſm had framed againſt the altar. The ſame means and the ſame ſucceſs will combine the conſpiracies. The ſame crimes and the ſame diſaſters will combine the revolutions.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Firſt Step in the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.

Voltaire and D'Alembert paſſing from the Hatred of Chriſtianity to the Hatred of Kings.

Voltaire at firſt friendly to Kings;

OUR attention to truth and juſtice with regard to a man, who was ſo far from both with reſpect to religion, obliges us to begin this chapter by a declaration, which might make Voltaire appear to be the fartheſt from an enemy, much leſs from being the author of a conſpiracy againſt the throne. If this man, the moſt unrelenting chief when conſpiring againſt Chriſtianity, had followed the bias of his own inclination; or had he been able to ſway his adepts in politics as he had in impiety, never would that oath of deſtroying the throne have iſſued from his ſchool.

Voltaire loved kings; their favor and their careſſes were his delight; he was even dazzled with their greatneſs. His ſentiments cannot be miſtaken, after having ſeen him glory in ſinging the praiſes of Lewis XIV. or Henry IV. kings of France; of Charles XII. king of Sweden; of the Czar Peter Emperor of all the Ruſſias; of Frederick II. king of Pruſſia; and of ſo many other kings both of ancient and modern times.

Voltaire

Voltaire had all the habits and manners of the great, and at his court of Ferney acted the Grandee perfectly well. He had too high an opinion of his own abilities to aſſimilate himſelf, by Equality, to that multitude which he contemptuouſly ſtiles, the beggarly *canaille*.

He was not only partial to kings, but even to the monarchical form of government. When he gives a looſe to his own ſentiments, and in his hiſtorical writings, we ſee him invariably preferring the dominion of ONE to that of the MANY. He could not endure the idea of having ſo many maſters as there were counſellors in the parliament *; how then could he adopt that liberty and ſovereignty of the people which would have given him as joint ſovereigns, the towns and ſuburbs, the peaſantry and his own vaſſals. He who ſo much delighted in reigning in his own caſtle, who was ſo jealous of his prerogatives in the midſt of his eſtates which he called his little Province, how could he wiſh to ſanction a Liberty and Equality which was to level the caſtle with the cottage?

Jealous of the title of faithful ſubject.

Beſide, Voltaire's principal object was to annihilate Chriſtianity; and he feared nothing ſo much as to be thwarted by the kings in his undertaking, on pretence that he equally aimed his blows at the throne as he did againſt the altar. It was for this reaſon that he perpetually warns the adepts of what

* Let. to D'Alembert.

conſe-

conſequence it was, that the Philoſophers ſhould be conſidered as faithful ſubjects. When aſſuring Marmontel how much he (Voltaire) was protected by Choiſeul and the courtezan Pompadour, he writes, that they may ſend him any thing without danger. "They know that we love the king and "the ſtate. It was not among us that ſuch people "as Damien heard the voice of rebellion. I am "draining a bog, I am building a church, and *I* "*pray for the king*. We defy either Janſeniſt or "Moliniſt to have a greater attachment for the "king than we have. My dear friend, the king "muſt be acquainted that the Philoſophers *are* "*more attached to him* than all the fanatics and hy-"pocrites in his kingdom *."

It was the ſelf-ſame motive which induced him to write to Helvetius (that Sophiſter whom we ſhall ſee ſo unrelenting in his hatred to kings), "*It* "*is the king's intereſt* that the number of Philo-"ſophers ſhould augment, and that of the Fana-"tics diminiſh. We are quiet, and they are all "diſturbers of the peace; *we are citizens*, they "are the children of ſedition. *The faithful ſer-*"*vants of the king*, and of reaſon, ſhall triumph "at Paris, at Vorei, and even at the Délices †."

Apprehenſive, however, that the Philoſophers might be ſuſpected, notwithſtanding all his pro-

* 13th Auguſt, 1760. † 27th October, 1760.

teſtations,

teſtations, he had already written thus to D'Alembert; "Do you know who the bad citizen is that "wiſhes to perſuade the Dauphin that France is "overrun with the enemies of religion? They "will not pretend to ſay, I hope, that Peter Da-"miens, Francis Ravaillac, and their predeceſ-"ſors were Deiſts and Philoſophers." Nevertheleſs, he ends his letter by ſaying, "I fear that "Peter Damiens will be a great detriment to "Philoſophy *."

Defends the authority of Kings.

Finally, if any thing can paint in ſtrong colours Voltaire's attachment to kings, it will be the method in which he treats thoſe of the adepts who dared attack the authority of the ſovereign. The adept Thiriot had ſent him a work on the *Theory of Taxation*, and Voltaire anſwers, "*Received the* "*Theory of Taxation*, an obſcure theory, and ap-"parently to me an abſurd one. All ſuch theo-"ries are very ill timed, as they only ſerve to "make foreign nations believe that our reſources "are exhauſted, and that they may inſult and at-"tack us with impunity. *Such men are very ex-*"*traordinary citizens indeed, and curious friends to* "*man.* Let them come where I am on the fron-"tiers, and *they will preſently change their opinions.* "*They will ſoon ſee how neceſſary it is that the king* "*and the ſtate ſhould be reſpected. Upon my word,* "*at Paris people ſee every thing topſy-turvy* †."

* 16th January, 1757. † 11th January, 1761.

The

The ſtauncheſt Royaliſt could not have inſiſted in a clearer manner on the neceſſity of ſupporting the Royal authority; nevertheleſs, he had already let fall many expreſſions which little denoted any zeal for the cauſe of kings. He had not adopted, as yet, that Philoſophiſm of rebellion, of Liberty and Equality, which was to fanaticiſe the French people, and raiſe Robeſpierres and Marats in ſucceſſion to the fanatics Ravaillac and Damiens. There were times even when he would have treated the Mirabeaux, La Fayettes and Baillys, as he uſed ſometimes to treat thoſe mad Œconomiſts, who, attacking the authority of kings, ſaw, through their pretended theory, every thing in a wrong light. But this love for his king was but a remnant of his firſt education, which Philoſophiſm had often belied, and of which the very trace would ſoon be eraſed from the heart of the Sophiſter.

Had Voltaire, either from his own ſentiments, or for the intereſt of the ſect, been ſtill more deſirous of being looked upon as a good citizen, or a faithful ſubject to the king, yet the adepts could have retorted the arguments he had perpetually repeated to ſtir them up againſt Chriſtianity, in too powerful a manner againſt his arguments in favor of kings, for him to have been able to withſtand them. It was but natural that men who had been taught to oppoſe their Liberty and Equality

Declines towards Liberty and Equality.

to

to the God of revelation, to his miniſters and prophets, ſhould alſo oppoſe them to the kings of the earth. Voltaire had taught them that the Equality of rights and Liberty of reaſon were incompatible with that power of the church and of the goſpel commanding a ſubmiſſion to and a belief in myſteries which were inconceivable by reaſon. The adepts, as the next ſtep, declare that the equality of men, the liberty of nature, were equally incompatible with any ſubmiſſion to the empire and laws of *one* man, or even of *many*, whether called parliaments or ſenates, lords or princes, pretending to the dominion over a whole nation, and dictating laws to the multitude, who had neither made them, diſcuſſed them, nor wiſhed for them.

Theſe principles, ſo forcibly inſiſted on by Voltaire when combating Chriſtianity, might naturally be objected to his propoſitions reſpecting ſubmiſſion to the ſovereign; and they were ſo. The adepts urged the conſequences, and the premier chief was unwilling to loſe the pre-eminence, over his own ſchool, in what he called Philoſophy. The proceſs by which he was led from the Sophiſtry of Impiety to that of Rebellion, is too much blended with the progreſs of his anti-religious Philoſophiſm, not to be worthy of inveſtigation.

Voltaire

Voltaire had been actuated by no other paſſion than that of hatred againſt Chriſt, when in the year 1718 he cauſed to be publicly recited in his tragedy of Œdipus thoſe two famous verſes, which alone comprehend the whole of that anti-religious revolution which was to be accompliſhed ſeventy years afterward:

> Prieſts are not what they ſeem to vulgar eyes,
> In our credulity their ſcience lies *.

Theſe two lines only proclaim that Equality of rights and Liberty of reaſon which, diſavowing the authority or miſſion of the clergy, leave the people at full liberty to form their religious tenets on whatever they may pleaſe to call their reaſon. But many years elapſed before Voltaire could form a correct idea of that liberty and equality which was to diveſt the monarch of his rights, as he had diveſted the church of her's. It even appears that he had not at that time any idea of deducing from this liberty and equality principles ſo fatal to monarchy; that he was perfectly ignorant of what Liberty and Equality, applied to civil ſociety, meant, when he publiſhed his epiſtles or diſcourſes on Liberty and Equality in 1738. The firſt leſſons he received on the ſubject were from his *eleve* Thiriot, whom he had

* Les pretrês ne ſont pas ce qu'on vain peuple penſe;
Notre credulité fait toute leur ſcience.

left

left in England, and from whom he wiſhed to learn what opinion the adepts had formed on thoſe epiſtles. Or, as is more probable, Thiriot, knowing his maſter's bias for ariſtocracy, only wrote that he had not ſufficiently *gone to the point*, and that he was not in complete poſſeſſion of the true principles. Piqued at ſuch a reproach, Voltaire, like a man who did not care to ſee himſelf outdone by his diſciples, writes, "A word on the Epiſtles. Where the devil do "you find that they do not go to the point. "There is not a ſingle verſe in the firſt epiſtle, "which does not ſhow the *equality of conditions*, "nor one in the ſecond which does not prove "*liberty* *."

Notwithſtanding this reply, the diſciple was in the right. He might have rejoined, that throughout the whole of the Epiſtles there was not a ſingle verſe which, philoſophically ſpeaking, was not a miſconſtruction; ſince, in the firſt, all that Voltaire aimed at proving was, that in all ſtations of life the ſum total of happineſs was nearly the ſame; and in the ſecond, liberty is conſidered much more as a phyſical faculty, than as a natural, civil, and political right. The inference drawn from the firſt is, that it is uſeleſs for man to trouble himſelf about the difference of ſtations as the ſame portion of happineſs is

* Letter to Thiriot, 24th October 1738.

nearly

nearly allotted to each; the ſecond does not even mention that liberty which the adepts ſo much inſiſt on againſt kings, and only aſſerts that liberty which ſo well demonſtrates the diſtinction of right and wrong, and which the ſect always looked upon as too favorable to religion.

Without ſeeming to ſubmit to his diſciples, Voltaire, nevertheleſs, gradually adopted their ſentiments; vexed at having aſſerted the rights of free agency, he counteracted all the influence that doctrine might have had, and gave his definition of liberty * ſuch a turn, that Predeſtinarians themſelves could not have cavilled at it. In a word, he no longer aſſerted any other liberty than that which has proved ſuch a powerful weapon againſt ſovereignty in the hands of the ſect.

The

* If we are to believe this definition, *Liberty* conſiſts in *the power of doing what we will*. A true metaphyſician would ſay, *The power itſelf, the faculty of willing or not willing*, that is to ſay, *of determining one's will, of chuſing and willing any thing, or the contrary*. Theſe two definitions are very different. It is not the *power* but the *will* which is culpable. A righteous man has frequently the ſame power of committing the ſame crime as the wicked man; but one wills it, while the other does not. The wicked man is at liberty *not* to will it, as the upright man is at liberty to will it; otherwiſe, there can be no moral difference between the good and the bad man. For how could the latter be culpable, if he had not had it in his power to will

The corrections he made in his Epiſtle on Equality, had a more direct affinity to the ſyſtem of the political revolution. In the firſt edition of that Epiſtle we read,

Equal the ſtate, in men the difference lies *.

The ſect wiſhed him to have ſaid,

Equal are men, in ſtates the difference lies †.

At length Voltaire underſtood their meaning, and bluſhed at finding that his own diſciples had made a greater progreſs in the knowledge of Equality than he had himſelf; and to avoid their future criticiſms he changed both his doctrine and his verſes. He corrected, and almoſt reconſtructed his Epiſtle on Equality; nor did he

the contrary? Suppoſe three men—the firſt *can* commit a bad action, but his will *freely rejects* it: The ſecond *can* accompliſh the ſame, and he *freely wills* it: The third not only *can* but he *irreſiſtibly wills* it. The firſt of theſe men will be a virtuous man, the ſecond a wicked man, the third a mere brutal machine, a madman who is neither maſter of his will nor of his reaſon. The wicked man and the mad one could and did will the ſame action. The difference does not lie in the power or the action, but in the will itſelf more or leſs free to will or not to will. But Voltaire and his ſophiſtical ſchool had their reaſons for not making ſuch diſtinctions.

* Les Etats ſont égaux, mais les hommes différent:
† Les hommes ſont égaux, et les états différent!

let

let his poetic genius reſt, till he had ſhown the adepts, that he underſtood the equality of man as well as they did, and that they could no longer reproach him with not *going to the point*. It was then that he wrote the following verſes, which contain all that the revolutionary populace have alledged againſt the wealthy, the nobility, and kings, in proof of its equality.

With calm indifference let my friend ſurvey
The pomp of riches and deſpotic ſway;
This world's a ball, where his undazzled eyes
Pierce thro' each filly actor's vain diſguiſe.
My Lord, your Highneſs, are the maſks that hide
Their little beings and exalt their pride;
But, men are equal; pride do what you can,
The maſk may differ but the ſame the man.
The five weak ſenſes by us all poſſeſt,
Of good, of evil, are our only teſt.
A ſlave has five, *ſix can the Monarch claim?*
The ſame his body and his ſoul the ſame *.

* Tu vois, cher Ariſton, d'un œil d'indifférence
La grandeur tyrannique, et la fiere opulence.
Tes yeux d'un faux éclat ne ſont point abuſés;
Ce monde eſt un grand bal, où des fous deguiſés,
Sous les riſibles noms d'Eminence et d'Alteſſe,
Penſent enfler leur être et hauſſer leur baſſeſſe.
Envain des vanités l'appareil nous ſurprend;
Les mortels ſont egaux, le maſque eſt différent.
Nos cinq ſens imparfaits, donnés par la nature,
De nos biens, de nos maux ſont la ſeule meſure.
Les Rois en ont-ils ſix? et leur ame et leur corps
Sont-ils d'une autre eſpèce? ont-ils d'autres reſſorts?

This is preciſely what the democratic rabble of Paris was wont to ſay, leſs elegantly indeed, when it aſked whether kings and nobles were not made of the ſame clay as the ſimple clown? Whether thoſe who enjoyed large fortunes had two ſtomachs? And of what uſe were all thoſe diſtinctions of Sovereigns, Princes, or Chevaliers, ſince *all men were equal*?

It was with reluctance, it muſt be confeſſed, that Voltaire became the Apoſtle of Equality. For without having a body or ſoul of a different ſpecies from that of Pompignan, Freron, or Desfontaines, or of ſo many other men whom he was perpetually overwhelming with his ſarcaſms, he nevertheleſs was aware that in the ſame ſpecies, and with the ſame nature, there exiſted no ſmall inequality among men; that without being endowed with a ſixth ſenſe, he felt the great diſtance there was between himſelf and the rabble he ſo much deſpiſed. At length he ſubmitted to the criticiſms of the adepts, and after having declared

Equal the ſtate, in men the difference lies *

he writes in abſolute oppoſition,

The maſk may differ but the ſame the man †.

---

* Les Etats ſont égaux, mais les hommes diffèrent ‡.

† Les mortels ſont égaux, le maſque eſt différent §.

‡ *1ſt and 2d Edit.* § *See the variations, edit. of Kell.*

As

As to that liberty which commences in the love of Republicaniſm, and ends in the hatred of Kings, it is probable that Voltaire would never have adopted it, had it not been neceſſary to eſtabliſh that liberty which was eſſential to the hatred of Chriſt; but he had found himſelf too much thwarted by the authority of Kings in his firſt publications againſt Chriſtianity. In Holland he enjoyed a greater liberty for printing his blaſphemies; and it was to that circumſtance, that he owed his bias for Republicaniſm. Thoſe who have read his correſpondence while in Holland, and particularly the following letter to the Marquis D'Argenſon, dated from the Hague, will not have a doubt that this was the caſe. "I am, ſays he, "better pleaſed even with the abuſes of the liberty "of the preſs here, than with that ſort of ſlavery "under which the human mind is kept in France. "If you continue on that plan, the ſimple re- "membrance of the glorious age of Lewis XIV. "will be all that will remain. This degeneracy "almoſt inclines me to ſettle in the country I am "now in. The Hague is a charming reſidence; "*liberty alleviates the rigors of the winter. I like to "ſee the Rulers of the State no more than plain Citi- "zens.* There are factions, it is true, yet they "muſt exiſt in Republics: But faction does not "damp patriotiſm, and I ſee great men contend- "ing with great men.—On the other ſide I ſee, "with

Becomes a Republican;

" with equal admiration, the chief members of " the ſtate walking on foot without ſervants, " living in houſes worthy of thoſe Roman Conſuls " who dreſſed their own roots; you would like " this government extremely, notwithſtanding all " thoſe imperfections which are unavoidable in it. " *It is entirely municipal, and that is what you ad-* " *mire* *."

All theſe expreſſions naturally denote a man declining towards a Republican Liberty and Equality, and who impatiently bore the yoke of Kings. A few years after, we may obſerve this paſſion much more predominant in Voltaire,* eſpecially in a letter which he is ſuppoſed to have written to an Academician of Marſeilles, and mentioned in Mr. de Bevis's Memoirs. " I ſhould accept your " invitation, were Marſeilles ſtill a Grecian Re- " public; for I greatly admire Academies, *but am* " *much more partial to Republics.* How happy are " thoſe countries where our maſters viſit us, and " are not affronted when we do not return to wait " on them!"

In all this, however, we ſee nothing more than a partiality for Republics; it was not poſitively a hatred of Kings, nor an imputation of tyranny and deſpotiſm in the regal government. But a few years after this, that ſame rancour is directed by Voltaire againſt the throne, which he had already

* Let. 8th Auguſt, 1743.

con-

conceived againſt the altar. Such at leaſt is clearly the purport of a confidential letter which he writes to D'Alembert, wherein he ſays, " As to " Duluc (the King of Pruſſia), ſometimes biting " ſometimes bitten, he muſt be a moſt unhappy " mortal; *and thoſe men who put themſelves in the* " *way of a muſket or a ſabre for ſuch gentry, are* " *moſt abominable fools.* Don't betray my ſecret " either to Kings or Prieſts *." His ſecret on Kings;

This, however, could be no ſecret to thoſe who had obſerved the modern Sophiſters trying to caſt all the odium of war and its miſeries on Kings and the nature of their governments, and wiſhing to perſuade the people that their only way of acquiring happineſs, and everlaſting peace, was, to take the government into their own hands by wreſting it from their Royal Maſters. This propoſition, ſo evidently contradicted by that perpetual ſtate of warfare, interior or exterior, ſo common to Republics, evinces that Voltaire had no care about proof, when he decided in ſo peremptory a ſtile, that thoſe who were perſuaded they were fighting for their country when rallied under the ſtandard of their King, were moſt abominable fools.

We ſhould particularly remark in this letter, how much his ſecret with regard *to Kings* is con-

12th December, 1757.

nected with that reſpecting *the Prieſthood*; and he had more than once publicly divulged them both. The latter he had expreſſed in the verſes already quoted from his Tragedy of Œdipus,

> Prieſts are not what they ſeem to vulgar eyes,
> In our credulity their ſcience lies *:

and as to the former, we ſee Voltaire by the ſame means teaching the people what they are to think with regard to Sovereigns, their rights, and their origin; or with regard to the Nobility, who are perpetually led and ſpurred on to the defence of their country in emulation of thoſe ſervices by which their anceſtors diſtinguiſhed themſelves. It would be in vain to excuſe the poet: it is a hatred of Kings, and not the genius of poetry, which inſpires ſuch artful turns, and makes the dramatic actor ſpeak the ſentiments of the Sophiſter. It certainly was not the love of Monarchy which dictated the following verſes, and cauſed them to be ſpoken on the ſtage of a nation under the dominion of a King, and proud of the atchievements of its Nobility. In his Tragedy of Mérope, he ſays,

His principles againſt Kings.

> Some lucky ſoldier was the firſt of Kings;
> Who ſerves the ſtate, no matter whence he ſprings †.

---

* Les pretrês ne ſont pas ce qu'un vain peuple penſe;
Notre credulité fait toute leur ſcience.

† Le premier qui fut Roi, fut un ſoldat heureux,
Que ſert bien ſon Pays, n'a pas beſoin d'ayeux.

When

When Voltaire taught this doctrine to the French people, the Antimonarchical Revolution had made as great a progreſs in his mind, as the Anti-chriſtian formerly had, when the verſes already quoted had been ſpoken againſt the Clergy. But nothing ſhort of the moſt abandoned Jacobiniſm could teſtify applauſe when Voltaire continues, *Do you wiſh to be happy? Never own a maſter* *.

It was thus that Voltaire, carried away by his Syſtem of Liberty oppoſed to the Altar, daily cheriſhed the ſentiments of that liberty which was to combat the throne. Nor was it inadvertently that theſe maxims eſcaped from his poetic genius. In his correſpondence with D'Alembert, his intention appears clearly when he points out to his confidant, all thoſe verſes which may teach the ſubject to riſe in judgment againſt his King, or even to become his aſſaſſin or executioner, ſhould he ever chuſe to view his Prince in the light of a tyrant or a deſpot. Exactly ſuch are the paſſages which he wiſhes D'Alembert to notice, when he writes, "Laſt year I hurried over a Play called "*The Laws of Minos*, which preſently you will "ſee hiſſed. In thoſe *Laws of Minos*, Teucer "ſays to Merion the Senator,

Our laws a change, our ſtate a King requires †.

* Dialogues of the Philoſophers on Happineſs.

† "Il faut changer de loix, il faut avoir un maitre.

The

The Senator anſwers:

Of me, my treaſures and my life diſpoſe,
But ſhould the pow'r this ſovereign rank beſtow
Be turn'd againſt our laws and native land,
Then ſhall my arm that guilty pow'r withſtand *.

Had Voltaire ever met with ſuch verſes in the writings of a Clergyman, he would immediately have attacked him as an aſſaſſin and a traitor; he would have exclaimed, Behold the ſubject who raiſes himſelf in judgment againſt his Sovereign, who takes upon him the right of deciding between his King and the Laws, the right of attacking and combating his King, and of turning his ſword againſt him, every time it may pleaſe him to believe, or to perſuade the people, that the death of the Prince would reſtore energy to the laws.—Voltaire would have immediately added, there we ſee the people decidedly created both judge and ſovereign over their Kings; ſuch are the maxims which form Rebels, and produce Revolutions with all their concomitant horrors of democratic anarchy.

What Voltaire would very properly have ſaid on this affectation of their making a diſtinction be-

* "Je vous offre mon bras, mes tréſors & mon ſang;
"Mais ſi vous abuſez de ce ſuprême rang,
"Pour fouler a vos pieds les loix & la patrie,
"Je la defends, Seigneur, au péril de ma vie †.

† *Letter of 13th November*, 1772.

tween

tween the King and the Country, hiſtory may as properly apply to Voltaire himſelf; more particularly as nobody knew the conſequences and danger of ſuch maxims better than he did; nor did he even make any ſecret of their dangerous tendency when writing to his friends. He begins his letter to the Count D'Argental on ſending him ſome of thoſe ſeditious publications, by ſaying, "In "the firſt place, promiſe me upon oath, that you "never will let my *petit pâtés* out of your hands, "that you will ſend them back to me, and in- "form me whether they are too highly ſeaſoned, "or whether the general taſte of the day is more "depraved than my own. *The forcemeat of my "petit pâtés is not quite palatable to a monarchy*; "but you told me *that a diſh of Brutus* had been "lately ſerved up at the Count de Falkenſtein's "(the name under which Joſeph II. travelled), "and that none of the gueſts had left the table *." Such language is not very enigmatical; but it paints Voltaire in very different colours from thoſe we have ſeen him in, when reproaching his Pariſian brethren with ſeeing every thing *topſy-turvy* in their attack on the King's power. It denotes an author who dares not yet ſhow his ſentiments ſo oppoſite to that power, but who wiſhes to go as far as poſſible without expoſing himſelf to danger. We ſee him flattering himſelf that he has not been

His ſecret and indirect attack againſt the throne.

* 27th July, 1777.

too

too daring, as Joſeph II. had been imprudent enough *to let a diſh of Brutus be ſerved up at his table*; that is to ſay, that monarch had heard broached at his table, without ſhewing his diſpleaſure, doctrines the moſt dangerous and threatening to the lives of Sovereigns.

He wiſhes for and foretells the Revolution.

There are many other letters extant, which indicate how deeply this Antimonarchical liberty had rooted itſelf in the heart of Voltaire, and even how much he deſpiſed that love for their Sovereign at that time ſo univerſally prevalent among the French people. There is one in particular, in which he complains moſt bitterly, that ſtrangers perfectly converſant in the catechiſm of liberty, and equal to the taſk of teaching it to the Pariſians, are obliged to carry their ſyſtems elſewhere, before they have ſucceeded in teaching them to the French people; that if man was created to ſerve God, *he was alſo created to be free* *. In ſhort, what diſpleaſed Voltaire more particularly was, that while he was making ſuch progreſs in this catechiſm of liberty, the French people, whom he calls his *Velches*, did not keep pace with him †. When the Hiſtorian ſhall treat of the progreſs which Voltaire was making in the arts of liberty, he ſhall not extenuate his error, by ſaying that Voltaire was not aware of the fatal conſequences of a revo-

* Letter to Damilaville, 23d March, 1764.

† Ibid. & paſſim.

lution,

lution, or that he would have ſtarted back from his purpoſe could he by poſſibility have foreſeen them. Certainly his ſoul could not be ſo ferocious as to have aſpired after the bloody reign of a Robeſpierre; but he complacently foretells, and offers up his prayers for a revolution, which he knows to be big with bloodſhed and ſurrounded with firebrands; and, however diſaſtrous ſuch revolutionary ſcourges may appear to him, he nevertheleſs deems thoſe perſons happy, who, from their juvenility, may live to ſee them. He writes to the Marquis de Chauvelin, "Every thing is "preparing the way to *a great revolution*, which "will moſt *undoubtedly take place*; and I ſhall not "*be fortunate enough to ſee it.* The French arrive "at every thing ſlowly, but ſtill they do arrive. "Light has ſo gradually diffuſed itſelf, that on the "firſt opportunity the nation will break out, *and* "*the uproar will be glorious. Happy thoſe who are* "*now young, for they will behold moſt extraordinary* "*things* *."

Let the reader notice the date of this letter, which is twenty-five years anterior to the French revolution. During the whole of that long period we ſhall never obſerve Voltaire reproaching the adepts with ſeeing every thing *topſy-turvy*, when they attack the Royal prerogative.

* 2d March, 1764.

Whether

Whether it was that the victories he had obtained over the altar gave him more confidence in his attacks againſt the Throne; or that the ſucceſs of his ſarcaſtic attacks gradually made againſt kings with impunity, had perſuaded him that they were not ſo formidable as he had believed them, either to himſelf or to his adepts; which of theſe was the true reaſon we cannot now determine. This however is certain, that ſo far from being ſtartled at the principles of inſurrection inculcated throughout the writings of his diſciples, he hugs himſelf in the idea that their productions were becoming the catechiſms of all nations.

When Diderot publiſhed his *Syſtem of Nature*, it was neither his attacks nor his frantic declamations againſt kings, that the Philoſopher of Ferney ſought to combat; but a kind of metaphyſics the abſurdity of which, he feared, would reflect on Philoſophy. Yet, notwithſtanding this abſurdity, and the violent declamations againſt ſovereignty, we find him exulting with D'Alembert in the ſucceſs of that abominable work, and bragging of its being *ſo greedily read throughout all Europe*, that people *ſnatched it* from each other. When he ſaw the courtiers and princes, encouraging new editions of Helvetius's work ON MAN AND HIS EDUCATION, notwithſtanding the ſeditious and antimonarchical principles it contained, and which will be noticed in the courſe of this work, Voltaire,

ſo

ſo far from fearing the indignation of kings, which ſuch writings would naturally draw down on his ſchool of Philoſophers, ſmiles exultingly with D'Alembert at the great ſucceſs of the work, and receives it as a proof that *the flock of ſages ſilently increaſed* *.

Thus it is that all his fears of irritating Sovereigns, by this apoſtleſhip of Liberty and Equality gradually ſubſide, and are ſucceeded by that thirſt of revolution, of *riot*, and of thoſe tempeſtuous ſcenes which were to accompany the downfal of Emperors and Kings, in a word, of all Sovereigns, or, in their philoſophical cant, of tyrants and deſpots.

D'Alembert's ſentiments againſt the throne.

Our readers, and future ages, will naturally inquire, whether D'Alembert walked in the footſteps of his dear maſter; whether, as zealous as Voltaire for the Anti-chriſtian liberty, he alſo adopted that liberty ſo inimical to royalty. Let D'Alembert ſpeak for himſelf: His anſwer is contained in a letter already quoted, but which may throw new light on this queſtion.

" You love REASON AND LIBERTY, my dear " brother; and a man can hardly love the *one* " without loving *the other*. Well then, here is a " worthy *Republican Philoſopher* whom I preſent

* Letter to D'Alembert, 16th July 1770. No. 114 and 117, anno 1773, and to the Ducheſs of Choiſeul, 1770.

" to

" to you, who will talk with you on PHILOSOPHY " AND LIBERTY: It is Mr. Jennings, chamber- " lain to the king of Sweden, a man of great me- " rit and enjoying a high degree of reputation in " his own country. He is worthy of your ac- " quaintance, both for his own merit, and for the " uncommon eſteem he has for your writings, " *which have ſo much contributed toward diſſeminat-* " *ing thoſe two principles among perſons worthy of* " *feeling them* *."

What an avowal is this for a man like D'Alembert, who was extremely cautious in his expreſſions, and always on his guard, leſt he ſhould utter any thing that might expoſe him to danger. *You love Reaſon and Liberty; and a man can hardly love the one, without loving the other.* A few lines lower, we find this *Reaſon* to be Philoſophy; and the ſubſequent *Liberty* to be that of a Republican Philoſopher; who nevertheleſs lives under a monarchy, loaded with the favors, and enjoying the confidence of his Sovereign. It is D'Alembert then who avows, that one can hardly love his pretended Philoſophy, without loving Republicaniſm, or *that liberty* which he believes not to exiſt under Monarchy.

It is D'Alembert again who ſelects from among the numerous claims which may entitle the ſophi-

* Letter to Voltaire, 19th January 1769.

ſtical

ſtical courtier to Voltaire's or his own eſteem, that of his love for Republican Philoſophy; though he certainly could not cultivate ſuch a diſpoſition, without ſecretly wiſhing to betray the cauſe of his King.

In ſhort, it is D'Alembert who extolls the writings of his dear and illuſtrious brother, as peculiarly adapted to diſſeminate *thoſe two principles of Republican Liberty and Republican Philoſophy among perſons worthy of feeling them*; or, in other words, as peculiarly adapted to fulfil the wiſhes of thoſe pretended ſages, who can find no liberty under the government of Kings, and who deteſt Monarchy in proportion to their love for Republics. He who believes himſelf worthy of feeling this *two-fold ſentiment*, he who acknowledges no Philoſophy as true if void of theſe two ſentiments, could he, I aſk, demonſtrate in a more forcible manner, how ardently they glowed in his heart, or how much he panted after thoſe revolutions which were to cruſh the throne, and eſtabliſh Republicaniſm on its ruin?

In drawing theſe inferences, let not the reader ſuppoſe that we mean to confound in all caſes a bias for Republics, or the love of Liberty, with the hatred of Kings, and the deſire of ſubverting every Throne. We are perfectly aware, that there exiſt many worthy Republicans, who, while they love their own Government, are not unmindful of the

reſpect due to thoſe of other Nations. Nor are we ignorant that true Civil Liberty is no leſs compatible with Monarchies than with Republics: indeed, it might not be difficult to prove, that the ſubject frequently enjoys a more real and extenſive Liberty under a Kingly, than under a Republican Government, eſpecially if a Democracy. But when we behold the Sophiſters perpetually complaining of the Government of Kings under whom they live, ſtyling their Sovereigns Deſpots, and ſighing after the Liberty of the Republican Philoſopher, we are certainly entitled to view their love for Liberty and Republicaniſm as blended with the hatred of Kings. If their blaſphemies againſt Chriſt, if what they call their Philoſophy be by any means thwarted, impatient of the rein, they burſt forth into complaint, and they exclaim, that *Reaſon is ſhackled*; that Deſpotiſm, *Decius like, perpetually perſecutes them*; or, that *man is unfortunate indeed* when he lives under the eye of a Monarch, or of his Miniſters *.

But to confine ourſelves to D'Alembert, let us recal to mind, that in the warfare againſt the altar, he acted the part of the fox. We ſhall ſee him employing the ſame cunning in his attack againſt the Throne. He will excite and ſtimulate others, he will even guide their pens; but he carefully

* See Voltaire's and D'Alembert's correſpondence *paſſim*.

avoids

avoids every thing by which he might himſelf be eventually endangered. It is thus that he lauds Voltaire, that he extols the zeal with which his dear brother propagates that Republican Liberty and Philoſophy; and fearing leſt this zeal ſhould ſometime abate, he adds, "Continue to fight as "you do, *pro aris et focis*; as for me, *my hands* "*are tied by miniſterial and ſacerdotal tyranny*; I can "only follow the example of Moſes, and raiſe "up my hands to heaven while you contend in "fight *."

Again, we find him informing Voltaire of the eagerneſs with which he reads and devours all thoſe writings in which that Premier Chief had combined his attacks againſt the Altar and the Throne. We ſee him applauding his ſarcaſtic wit, and thus addreſſing him: "I am almoſt angry when I learn "from public report, that without informing me "of it you have given a ſlap to Fanaticiſm and "Tyranny, and that without detriment to the "ſwingeing blows which you apply in ſo maſterly "a manner on other occaſions. You enjoy alone "the privilege of covering with odium and ridi-"cule thoſe two peſts of ſociety †."

During this warfare, it was not the good fortune of all the adepts to gain the applauſe of D'Alembert. They had not, like Voltaire, the art of

* 19th January, 1769.

† Letter from D'Alembert, 14th July, 1767.

pleaſing or amuſing Kings, who did not perceive that the ſarcaſtic wit and ſatire of his romances and hiſtorical productions fell on their own heads, though ſeemingly aimed only at the perſons of other Kings.

It was not every one of the adepts that had the art of throwing the living into contempt, by ſtriking at the dead; of flattering the perſon of the Sovereign, and rendering ſovereignty odious; nor ſhall we find D'Alembert equally pleaſed with all thoſe who appear in array againſt the Royal cauſe. Some of them, too eager, ſaid too much; others were awkward in their attacks, and theſe he ſtyles *bunglers who are to be found every where* *. Others again were not ſufficiently bold. He will allow them wit, but he wiſhes *them to be leſs favorable to Deſpotiſm*; and the reader will eaſily conceive what he would have written himſelf if his *hands had not been tied*, when he confidentially writes to Voltaire, *I hate Deſpots almoſt as much as you do yourſelf* †.

It would be futile to object, that the hatred of Deſpotiſm does not infer the hatred of Kings. We know that; but who are the Deſpots implied by our Sophiſters, if not the Kings under whom they lived. Were the Emperor of the Turks, or the Grand Mogul, who had nothing to do with our Philoſophers, the objects of their repeated

* 24th January, 1778. † 23d January, 1770.

com-

complaints and hatred? Such objections are unworthy of being noticed. Their language is known; and ſufficient proofs will occur to ſhow, that with the ſect *Deſpots or Tyrants* and *Sovereigns or Kings* are ſynonymous terms. The very affectation of confounding them together ſhows that the hatred of the one and of the other were blended in the hearts of the Chiefs and of their Adepts.

In ſhort, the compliments of D'Alembert are not the ſole proofs with which the adepts have furniſhed us of the great part Voltaire had taken in that revolution ſo fatal to Monarchy, and which he ſo exultingly foreſaw. Had he never aimed his ſarcaſtic wit, ſo much admired by the ſophiſters, at the perſons of Kings, ſtill he would have been the man, at leaſt in the eyes of his ſchool, who had ſmoothed the way, who had ſcaled the rampart, to aſſail the Throne and ſhiver the Scepter of the pretended Tyrants; in a word, to contrive what the French Revolution has ſince accompliſhed, both with reſpect to the crown and perſon of the unfortunate Lewis XVI.

Avowal of the ſect concerning Voltaire.

Theſe important ſervices are thus appreciated by Condorcet: "Shall (ſays he) men who would "ſtill have been ſlaves to prejudice if Voltaire "had not written, accuſe him of betraying the "cauſe of Liberty!—They cannot underſtand that "if Voltaire had inſerted in his writings the "principles of the elder Brutus, that is to ſay,

" thoſe of the American Act of Independence, " neither Monteſquieu nor Rouſſeau could have " publiſhed their works. Had he, as the Author " of the Syſtem of Nature did, obliged all the " Kings of Europe to ſupport the aſcendancy of " the Clergy, Europe would ſtill have remained " *in the bonds of ſlavery and buried in ſuperſtition.* " They will not reflect, that in our writings, as " in our actions, we are to make no more than a " neceſſary diſplay of courage *."

Condorcet, in writing this, ſeems to have conſidered himſelf as having diſplayed a ſufficient courage, as he did not think it neceſſary to ſay, that the throne would have remained unſhaken, if Voltaire had not begun by eradicating religion from the minds of the people. His brethren the hebdomadary adepts, criticized the panegyriſt as not having ſufficiently extolled the ſervices which Voltaire had rendered. At that period the French Revolution was at its ſummit. Lewis XVI. was reduced to a mere phantom of royalty in his palace, or rather priſon, of the Thuilleries. The literary part of the Mercure was conducted by La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort; and theſe reviewers undertake to inform the unfortunate Monarch of the hand which had wrought the downfall of his throne. In giving an account of

* Life of Voltaire, edit. Kell.

the

the life of Voltaire, written by the Marquis de Condorcet, the hebdomadary Philoſophers ſpeak in the following terms:

" It appears that it would have been poſſible to " ſhow in a clearer light, *the eternal obligations* " *which human nature has to Voltaire.* Circum- " ſtances were favorable. *He did not foreſee all that* " *he has done, but he has done all that we now ſee.* " The enlightened obſerver and the able hiſtorian " will prove to thoſe who are capable of reflexion, " *that the firſt Author of the great Revolution, which* " *aſtoniſhes all Europe, which infuſes hope into the* " *hearts of nations, and diſquiet into courts, was,* " *without doubt, Voltaire.* He was the firſt who " levelled that formidable rampart of Deſpotiſm, " the religious and ſacerdotal power. Had he " not broken the yoke of Prieſts, that of Tyrants " never could have been ſhaken off; both equally " weighed upon our necks, and were ſo intimately " interwoven, that, the firſt once ſlackened, the " latter muſt ſoon have loſt its hold. The hu- " man mind is no more to be impeded in the " career of independence than it is in that of ſla- " very; and it was Voltaire who took off the " yoke, by teaching it to judge, in every reſpect, " thoſe who kept it in ſubjection. It was he who " rendered reaſon popular; and if the people had " not learned to think, never would it have known " its own ſtrength. The reflexions of the ſage

" prepare *Political Revolutions*, but it is the arm " of the people which executes them *."

Reſult of theſe avowals.

Had I no other object in view than to demonſtrate that theſe men, ſtyling themſelves Philoſophers, and glorying in the ſchool and name of Voltaire, chiefly aimed at the overthrow of Monarchy when they attacked religion; that it was to the ſucceſsful warfare which Voltaire had carried on againſt the religion of Chriſt that they peculiarly attribute their ſucceſs againſt the Throne; that by the appellation of Tyrant and Deſpot they pointed at the beſt of Kings and moſt rightful of Sovereigns: had this been my only object, I ſay, it would have been uſeleſs to continue theſe Memoirs on the Antimonarchical Conſpiracy, or that of the Sophiſters of Rebellion againſt every King.

And who are theſe Sophiſters that declare ſo openly and ſo expreſsly the ſecret of the ſect? Firſt view Condorcet, the moſt reſolute Atheiſt, the deareſt of the brethren, the ſteady ſupport of Voltaire's hopes, the moſt intimate confidant of D'Alembert †. It is he who ſets out by declaring, that, if Voltaire had not combated Religious prejudices, or that if he had attacked Regal authority

* Mercure de France, Saturday, 7th Auguſt, 1790. No. 18, p. xxvi.

† See the firſt part of theſe Memoirs.

in a more direct manner, France would have remained enſlaved.

Next on the liſt we find the Journaliſts La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort, who, in the moſt celebrated journal of the ſect, complain that Condorcet has not ſhown ſufficient courage, and that he is not ſufficiently explicit on the pretended *eternal obligations* which mankind have to Voltaire, who by ſhaking religion to its foundations has overturned the Throne, who by the ruin of the Pontiff has ſtruck the Tyrant.

And who is the Tyrant, the Deſpot over whom they ſo loudly triumph? A King whoſe very name echoes to that of juſtice and goodneſs; a Monarch almoſt adored by his people, and who loved them to a degree of weakneſs; for he very often repeated, that he would not ſuffer one drop of his ſubjects blood to be ſpilt in his defence.

Will hiſtory believe, that the unfortunate Lewis XVI. was the Deſpot over whom they triumph. And yet if any King upon earth ſhould believe that he is not comprehended in the general ſubverſion aimed at by the conſpirators, let him hearken: It is not of France alone that they ſpeak, but of *all mankind:* it is mankind that they pretend to behold enſlaved under Kings; and that *hope* which they had infuſed into the heart of man, is the ſame which they joyfully obſerve expanding itſelf

itſelf through all nations! If now tranquil on his throne, let him remember, that he is deſtitute of the prudence which even the Conſpirators ſuppoſe him to be endowed with. They believe *diſquiet to be infuſed into every Court*; for they well know, that their principles and their lawleſs attempts openly menaced monarchy. Yes, that their conſpiracy was univerſal, is already evident; hiſtory needs no farther proof: But before they dared proclaim it, that conſpiracy had its gradations; its means are to be laid open. The firſt ſtep is that hatred againſt the throne, flowing in the hearts of the chiefs, from the hatred they had conceived againſt their God. The ſecond will be found in the inveſtigation of thoſe ſyſtems deviſed by the adepts to overthrow regal authority, and ſubſtitute another in its ſtead. The teachers of the ſect had applied the vague principles of Liberty and Equality to Religious tenets; and hence originated the hatred of Chriſt and his Church. From the ſame principles applied to politics aroſe thoſe theories and ſyſtems of ſubverſion, with which the ſect aſſails every throne.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Second Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.

Political Syſtems of the Sect.

D'Argenſon and Monteſquieu.

AMONG the adepts who muſt have foreſeen the conſequences which naturally enſued from the application of a pretended equality of rights, and of an irreligious liberty, to politics, none could have done ſo more intuitively than the Marquis D'Argenſon. This man, miniſter of the foreign department, had lived during the greater part of his life near the perſon of his Sovereign, and enjoyed that favour, to which he was thought to be entitled by having conſecrated his life in the Royal ſervice. Yet he was the man who, during the reign of Lewis XV. drew the outlines of thoſe Sophiſticated Syſtems, which were to oppoſe Regal authority, and gradually metamorphoſe the French Monarchy into a Republic. D'Argenſon's ſyſtem.

We have ſeen Voltaire, as early as the year 1743, extolling the affection which this Marquis bore to Equality, to Liberty, and to the Municipal Government. Theſe praiſes of the Premier Chief evidently ſhow, that Mr. D'Argenſon had already con-

conceived his Municipalizing Syſtem, and all thoſe wild plans, which the future rebels, under the title of a Conſtituent Aſſembly, were to adopt as one of the leading features of their Royal Democracy, at once the moſt ſenſeleſs and moſt ſeditious as well as the moſt heterogeneous form of government that could be conceived, and more eſpecially for Frenchmen: They alſo prove, that he made no ſecret of his plans to his confidents and co-operators.

His ſyſtem conſiſts in the diviſion and ſubdiviſion of the Provinces into ſmall States, firſt called *Provincial Adminiſtrations* by Necker, and afterwards termed *Departments* by Target and Mirabeau.

According to D'Argenſon's plan, reſumed and corrected by Turgot and Necker, each of thoſe petty ſtates was, under the inſpection of the King, to be charged with the interior adminiſtration of its diſtricts, and the levying of taxes; to ſuperintend the different plans adopted for the relief of the people; to inſpect the hoſpitals, the high roads, the eſtabliſhments uſeful to commerce and other ſuch objects. The adminiſtrators could not determine on any ſubject of importance without the orders of his Majeſty, and this was judged a ſufficient fence to the Royal prerogative, eſpecially as at the firſt formation of theſe provincial adminiſtrations, one half of the members were to be nomi-

nominated by the King, which half when aſſembled choſe the remaining moiety. The diſtinction of the three orders, of the Clergy, the Nobility, and the third Eſtate, was preſerved, as it uſed to be in the States General *.

The towns and boroughs, and even the villages were to have their reſpective municipalities, all acting on the ſame plan, and under the direction of the Provincial Adminiſtrations, in their ſecondary diſtricts.

Though at firſt ſight this ſyſtem appears extremely advantageous, yet, on examination, we ſhall find, that its ſole tendency was to apply Republican forms, as much as circumſtances would permit, to a Monarchical government; that its object was to cramp the authority of the Monarch, to clog and weaken it; and to annihilate the power of his officers, or direct agents, the intendants of provinces. Natural effects of this ſyſtem.

Soon was France by means of theſe aſſemblies and their committees, or permanent offices, to be filled with ambitious men ſtarting forth in the new political career; men indeed who in the firſt inſtance, would have recognized the authority of a King, but who would ſoon have conſidered themſelves better informed of the wants of the people (being nearer to them) than his miniſters, and

* See D'Argenſon's plans, &c. on the nature of governments.

therefore

therefore more fully acquainted with the means of alleviating their diſtreſſes. Remonſtrances and philoſophic reaſonings would ſoon have followed, and ſufficed to juſtify diſobedience. The people, under a fond perſuaſion, that theſe provincial adminiſtrators ſupported their intereſts againſt the court, would eaſily have been brought to believe them the bulwark of their liberties and privileges, aſſigning every happy event to them, and attributing every misfortune to the King and his miniſters. Each municipality coaleſcing with the adminiſtrators, a hundred petty Republics ſtart into exiſtence, ready to league againſt their Sovereign, who, under the title of King, would ſcarcely have retained the authority of a Doge.

In time we ſhould have ſeen a ſwarm of politicaſters, or petty tribunes, ſallying forth from theſe adminiſtrative bodies, who would have left no means untried to perſuade the populace that ſuch a King was rather a burden than an advantage to the ſtate; that it would be proper to lay him aſide, ſince he was unneceſſary; that the provincial and municipal adminiſtrations would then be able to follow up in a more effectual manner, the ſalutary meaſures they had conceived for the good of the people: and thus, ſtep by ſtep, the Monarchical government would have been overthrown, and a municipal adminiſtration eſtabliſhed, with the freedom of which Voltaire and D'Argenſon

ſon had been ſo faſcinated in Holland. The man who could not readily foreſee that ſuch would be the conſequence of this municipalizing ſyſtem, muſt have been very ignorant of the character of Frenchmen, and eſpecially of French Philoſophers when drawn into the vortex of modern politics.

Even the admiſſion of the clergy into theſe proviſional adminiſtrations muſt have proved a fatal boon to the church, as it neceſſarily tended to change the ſpirit of its miniſters. Prieſts and biſhops were admitted, or rather called upon, to form a part of theſe adminiſtrations, ſo foreign to their ſacred functions, for the conſpiracy had not yet attained ſufficient force to caſt them off. The zeal for ſalvation was to be ſuperſeded by the wild ambition of moving in a ſphere ſo contrary to their calling. Already were ſeveral prelates diſtinguiſhed by this new title of Adminiſtrators. Soon ſhould we have ſeen them become rather the diſciples of D'Argenſon, Turgot and Necker, than of Chriſt; ſoon ſeen the biſhopricks conferred upon none but Morellets and Beauvais, with whom religion would have been a very ſecondary object, when compared to the glorious enterprize of ſyſtem-making, or of reſiſting the Miniſters and the Sovereign. This was a ſure method of ruining the church, by robbing her of the real biſhops, and ſubſtituting petty politicians, who would eaſily be

be carried away by the torrent of impiety and ambition, and join with heart and hand a Brienne or an Expilli.

Whatever might have been the conſequence to the church, it is very evident that all theſe new forms of adminiſtration tended directly to republicanize the ſtate. Each of theſe petty adminiſtrators would ſoon have ſwelled himſelf into the repreſentative of the province, and the aggregate would have ſtyled themſelves the Repreſentatives of the Nation. The bare appellation of National Repreſentative, combined with Modern Philoſophiſm, ſufficed to cruſh the Monarchy.

D'Argenſon did not live to witneſs the experiment of his ſyſtem; ſome may ſuppoſe that he had not foreſeen its conſequences. But it plainly appears, that if he even had foreſeen them, ſo great an admirer of municipalized Republics would not have been much alarmed. At a time when the Sophiſters had not ſufficiently eraſed the love of religion from the hearts of the French to efface their affection for their Monarch, this ſyſtem appeared to make but little impreſſion; but we ſhall ſee the Sophiſters afterward making it the particular object of their diſſertations, to accuſtom the people to the idea of governing themſelves *.

* Suppl. to Social Contract, part 3. chap. 2. by Gudin.

To

To the great misfortune of France, a man far more capable than D'Argenſon of giving to any ſyſtem the appearance of deep thought and erudition, engaged in theſe political ſpeculations. The love of the commonweal may appear to have directed him toward this ſtudy; but the real cauſe is to be found in the reſtleſſneſs of Philoſophiſm, and in that liberty of thinking which is diſguſted with every thing around it, and which would continue reſtleſs even after having attained the object of which it was in ſearch. This man, who by ſo many claims commands the public veneration was Charles Secondat, Baron de la Brede and De Monteſquieu. He was born on the 18th of January 1689, in the Chateau de la Brede, within three leagues of Bourdeaux; and in 1716, became preſident *à mortier* of that parliament. We have already mentioned, that his firſt productions were thoſe of a young man who had no fixed principles of religion; and this is clearly perceptible in peruſing the *Lettres Perſannes*. At a riper age his duty called him to the ſtudy of the laws; but not content with the knowledge of the code of his own country, and deſirous of making himſelf converſant in thoſe of foreign nations, he made the tour of Europe, ſtayed ſometime in England, and then returned to France full of thoſe ideas which he has developed in the two works that have chiefly contributed to his fame. The firſt is entitled, *Conſi-* Monteſquieu.

derations on the Cauſes of the Grandeur and Decline of the Roman Empire, and was publiſhed in 1733; the latter was, *The Spirit of Laws*, which appeared in 1748.

Monteſquieu's firſt attacks on the Throne.

It was obvious, on the firſt appearance of his work on the Romans, that Monteſquieu had not acquired from his travels an additional eſteem for the government of his own country. One of the prime cauſes to which he attributes the eclat of the Romans, is their love of a Liberty which begins by dethroning all Kings. The Sophiſters, who were ſtill leſs favorable to Monarchy, did not fail to adopt this idea, to make it the leading principle, and to inculcate it in all their diſcourſes *.

Both Monteſquieu and his panegyriſts would have been more correct, had they traced back to this love of liberty all thoſe ſcourges and inteſtine broils which harraſſed Rome, from the expulſion of its Kings until the reign of the Emperors. Liberty perpetually convulſed the people, and the ſenate could only free themſelves from their clamours by habitual war and foreign pillage. This perpetual ſtate of hoſtility rendered the Roman the most warlike of all nations, and gave them that immenſe advantage which they enjoyed over all other people. To the man who has read the Roman hiſtory, nothing can be more evident.

* Eloge de Monteſquieu by D'Alembert.

But

But if ſuch be the merits of that liberty which expelled the Kings from Rome, that antiſocial ſpirit, which, ſowing diſcord in the interior œconomy of families, drives them from their homes, inures them to fatigue and the inclemency of the weather, and gives them all the advantages and ſtrength of robbers, by forcing them to live on plunder, after having denied them the ſweets of ſocial life,—the Antiſocial ſpirit, I ſay, muſt needs poſſeſs the very ſame advantages.

His Paradoxes on the Kings of Rome.

Monteſquieu was ſo ſtrangely miſled by his admiration for liberty, that he did not perceive the ſtrangely paradoxical poſitions that he advanced. After having ſpoken of the public edifices, *which even to this day give us a great idea of the power and grandeur of Rome under its Kings*, after having ſaid, "that one of the cauſes of its proſperity was, that "its Kings were all great men, and that no coun-"try could ever ſhew *ſuch a continued ſeries of "ſtateſmen and great generals*;" he adds, nearly in the ſame page, "that on the expulſion of the "Kings it muſt neceſſarily follow, either that "Rome would change its government, or remain "a poor and petty monarchy *. In a word, that if Rome arrived at that very high pitch of greatneſs, it was owing to its having *ſubſtituted annual Conſuls* to the dethroned Kings.

* Conſiderations, &c. &c. on the Romans.

This work teems with ſatyrical remarks on Rome, when again brought under the dominion of a Monarch; and his frequent expreſſions of regret for the loſs of the Republican Liberty, could not but tend to diminiſh that love, that admiration, that enthuſiaſm ſo natural to Frenchmen for their King. One might really ſuſpect that he wiſhed to inſtil into the minds of the people a belief, that what Sovereigns call eſtabliſhing order, is another term for riveting fetters on their ſubjects *.

His Spirit of Laws.

But the work that we have been conſidering was merely a prelude to the doctrines which he was about to teach *(in his Spirit of Laws)* to all nations governed by a Monarch. Let us premiſe, and with great ſincerity we ſay it, that had we to perform the taſk of a panegyriſt, cauſes for admiration would abound; had we to anſwer thoſe critics who reproach Monteſquieu with having taken the motto, *prolem ſine matre creatam*, and giving his work as if it were an original, though he may appear to have followed the footſteps of Bodin, celebrated for his work on Republics, we nevertheleſs think we may triumphantly anſwer, that the dregs he may have borrowed from others cannot alloy the ſterling value of his own production; and that in ſpite of the errors contained in the

* Chap. 13.

Spirit

Spirit of Laws, it will for ever continue to be conſidered as the work of a wonderful genius *.

But it is not for us to aſſume the character, either of the critic or of the panegyriſt. Our object is to inveſtigate how far Monteſquieu broached or influenced revolutionary ideas. It is the misfortune of a great genius, that his very errors are too often converted into oracles. Truth muſt often ſubmit to error, when that error is ſupported by a celebrated name! That victory which he would have diſclaimed, reſulted merely from the

* We may ſafely aſſert, that if Monteſquieu has borrowed ſuch droſs as the Syſtem of Climates from Bodin, he has thrown aſide many articles which by no means coincided with his ideas: For example, the definition of a Sovereign given by Bodin could never agree with Monteſquieu's notions of a free people, or of its repreſentatives. The former is exaggerated. In Bodin's language, we might ſay, that the covenant by which the Sovereign is conſtituted, gives him the right of diſpoſing at pleaſure of the lives and fortunes of every citizen: That the ſole diſtinction between the Tyrant and the lawful King is, that the former exerciſes his authority for the ſubjugation, while the latter exerts his for the happineſs of the people. The generality of Monteſquieu's principles appear not to recognize a ſufficient Sovereignty in the real Monarch; but the oppoſite exceſs into which Bodin had fallen may, by diſguſting Monteſquieu, have driven him into the oppoſite extreme. In ſhort, whether this criticiſm be correct or not is of little conſequence, our object being to repreſent Monteſquieu's ideas exactly as he has expreſſed them, in whatever part of the work they may be found.

celebrity of his name, and the weight of his authority. The diſtinction which he makes between the principles of Monarchy and thoſe of Republicaniſm may convince the reader. In an ordinary writer, the whole of that part of the Spirit of Laws would have been looked upon as the ſport of imagination playing upon words. But from Monteſquieu they are received as the reſult of profound thought, ſanctioned by the great name of hiſtory. Let us examine whether the notions branding Monarchy with diſgrace can originate from any thing but the abuſe of terms.

His diſtinction between the principles of Monarchies and of Republics.

Honour, in the general acceptation of his countrymen, was the fear of being deſpiſed, and a horror particularly of being looked upon as a coward. It was the ſentiment of Glory and of Courage. When a more moral ſentiment attached itſelf to *honour*, it was converted into the ſhame of having done, or of hearing oneſelf reproached as having done, ſome act unworthy of an honeſt man; for inſtance, as having broken one's word. Monteſquieu, obſerving the deſpotic influence which this word exerciſed over his countrymen, adopted *honour* as the firſt principle, the main ſpring, the prime mover of Monarchies, and flatters Republics with having virtue for their firſt principle *. The chivalry of the French, pleaſed

* Spirit of the Laws, Book III. Chap. 3. and following.

with

with the idea, applauds Monteſquieu, but does not perceive that in adopting the word he falſifies the ſentiment and metamorphoſes it into *a falſe honour, a prejudice, a thirſt of fame, an ambition for diſtinctions or for favor*; in a word, into all the vices of the courtier *. This was bewildering *honour*; it was telling thoſe bold Knights, ſo zealous for their King, that they were no more than effeminate courtiers, ambitious men, and ſlaves to a prejudice the ſource of all the vices of Courts: an aſſertion the more evidently falſe, as many a Frenchman replete with true honour was entirely free from any of thoſe vices. Such a diſtinction was not only odious and diſgraceful, it was alſo deluſive, and the deluſion ſeems to have prevented Monteſquieu from perceiving that hereafter Philoſophiſm would adopt the principle, but would only repeat the word *honour* as the oppoſite *to virtue, the principle of Republics*, and brand the Royaliſts with all the falſe prejudices, the ambition, and other vices, which he had artfully aſcribed to *honour*.

This firſt error therefore was the offspring of deluſion. Though, in one ſenſe, as much may be ſaid of the pretended principle of Democracies. In another point of view, however, this principle may be introduced with more correctneſs; and

* Ib. Chap. 7, & *paſſim*, Book III. and V.

this latter ſenſe appears to be that to which Monteſquieu at firſt alluded. It is undeniable, that virtue ought to be more particularly the principle of Democracies than of any other form of Government, they being the moſt turbulent and the moſt vicious of all; in which virtue is abſolutely neceſſary to control the paſſions of men, to quell that ſpirit of cabal, anarchy, and faction inherent to the Democratic form, and to chain down that ambition and rage of dominion over the people, which the weakneſs of the laws can ſcarcely withſtand.

But it would have been ſatyric in the extreme to have adopted this latter ſenſe; and Monteſquieu's great admiration for the ancient Democracies would never permit him to give ſuch an explanation of the principle. He therefore generalizes or particularizes his definitions as ſuits his purpoſe. At one time *this virtue*, the prime mover of Republics, is *the love of one's country—that is to ſay, of Equality—is a political, and not a moral virtue* *. *At another, this political is a moral virtue*, as it is directed to the public good †. In one place it is not *the virtue of individuals* ‡, though in another it is every thing that can be underſtood *by good morals*, or by the virtue of a people *who are pre-*

* Advertiſement of the Author to the new Edition.
† Note to chap. 5, Book III. ‡ Ibid.

ſerved

ſerved from corruption by the goodneſs of their maxims *. Again, it is the moſt common virtue in that ſtate where "theft is blended with the "ſpirit of juſtice; the hardeſt ſervitude with ex-"ceſs of Liberty, the moſt atrocious ſentiments "with the greateſt moderation;" in ſhort, it is the virtue of that ſtate where "natural ſenti-"ments are preſerved without the tie of ſon, "huſband, or father, and where even chaſtity "is denuded of modeſty and ſhame †."

Whatever idea the reader may have formed of virtue through the miſt which appears to have enveloped the genius of Monteſquieu in enigmatic darkneſs, let us aſk, which principle will he adopt, or which will he conceive to be the moſt clearly expreſſed? If aſked, whether virtue was not alſo to be found in Monarchies, he will anſwer, "I know that virtuous Princes are no "uncommon ſight; but I venture to affirm, *that in* "*a Monarchy* it is extremely difficult for the peo-"ple to be virtuous ‡;" and this ſentiment, ſo odious and ſo injurious to all Royaliſts, will in the end be the moſt clearly deduced of all the new opinions he has broached upon Monarchical Government. Whether ſuch were his intentions or not, a day will come, when the Sophiſters, re-

* Chap. 2, Book I. † Chap. 6, Book IV.
‡ Chap. 5, Book III.

peating

peating his aſſertions, will ſay to the people, "You only love your King becauſe you have not "a ſufficient ſenſe of Philoſophy to raiſe your- "ſelves above *the prejudices of ambition and of falſe* "*honour*; becauſe you are deſtitute of thoſe *moral* "*virtues which direct to the public good*; becauſe "you are not inflamed with *the love of your Coun-* "*try*; becauſe you admire that form of Govern- "ment, where it is *extremely difficult for the people to* "*be virtuous*. You would admire *Democracy* were "your *morals good*, and were you fired with the "*amor patriæ*—but, deſtitute of virtue and unac- "quainted with Philoſophy, you are only capable "of loving your Kings."

Such, as every reflecting reader muſt perceive, is the real explanation of theſe principles. The Revolution has only brought them into practice. We have heard a Robeſpierre and a Sieyes, proclaiming to the people, that in cruſhing the Scepter, murdering their King, and conſtituting France a Republic, they had *only put virtue on the order of the day*. In the midſt of maſſacres and bloodſhed, they profaned the ſacred name of virtue; and with virtue in their mouths they plunged the people into the moſt horrid ſcenes of vice and debauchery. But have we not ſeen Monteſquieu teaching them how to blend virtue with the *moſt atrocious ſenti-* *ments*, and how it may reign amidſt the *hardeſt ſer-* *vitude, or the exceſs of Liberty?* Attributing ſuch inten-

intentions, to this celebrated writer would moſt certainly be doing injuſtice to his memory; but ſtill it is our duty to ſpeak unreſervedly on what he has written, and to ſhew what ſentiments nations may have imbibed from his writings. It is awful to reflect (whatever may have been his intentions) on the terrible ravages which his opinions, ſupported by the authority of his name, have operated in the minds of men. Error is in its infancy with Monteſquieu; but it is the ſame error that was afterwards, in the ſtate of manhood, adopted by Robeſpierre. Monteſquieu would have ſhrunk back with horror had he heard that Democratic villain place virtue *for the order of the day* with his ſanguinary Republic; but what could the aſtoniſhed maſter have replied, on being told, *that it was extremely difficult for the people to be virtuous under a Monarch*, or under Lewis XVI.?

Let genius ſhrink back with horror at ſeeing its errors traverſe the immenſe interval between Monteſquieu and Robeſpierre; let it tremble at its deſpotic influence over the public opinion. Without deſigning any convulſion, by its very name it may raiſe the moſt dreadful ſtorm. At firſt, its errors may be tender ſhoots; but, daily gaining bulk and ſtrength, will not at length a Condorcet, a Petion, or a Sieyes, wield the maſſive limb?

During a long period Monteſquieu's opinions on the principles of Monarchies and Republics were

were entirely overlooked, and they might have remained in oblivion at any other time, when Philoſophiſm was leſs active in its reſearch after every means of rendering the Throne odious.—Almoſt as much may be ſaid of that *Equality* which, he believed, "in Democracy limited ambition to the ſole deſire of doing greater ſervices to our country, than the reſt of our fellow-citizens *:" a virtue far too ſublime for Monarchies, "where nobody aims at Equality; it does not ſo much as enter their thoughts; they all aſpire to ſuperiority. People of the very loweſt condition deſire to emerge from their obſcurity only to lord it over their fellow-ſubjects †." Genius may have been ſo led away, as not to perceive how powerful a weapon it was forging for the Jacobin, who, extolling the merits of this Equality, and perſuading the people that it was impracticable under the dominion of the Monarch, would alſo paint in glowing colours *that ambition of ſerving the country*, ariſing from the aſhes of the Throne and the deſtruction of the Nobility. But there appeared another ſyſtem in the *Spirit of Laws*, deeper laid, and replete with weapons more directly pointed at the Throne. They were the firſt on which Philoſophiſm ſeized, while others adopted them through ignorance, from

* Chap. 3, Book V. † Chap. 4, Book V.

want

want of reflection, or from imprudence. They were too fatal in the hands of the firſt rebels not to claim a place in theſe Memoirs.

State of the French Monarchy, when his ſyſtem on the diſtinction of Powers appeared.

To form a correct idea of the Revolutionary tendency of Monteſquieu's ſyſtem, we muſt revert to the time at which it was publiſhed. Whatever may have been the Legiſlative forms in the primitive days of the French Monarchy, it is certain that at the time of his publication (and he avows it) not only the King of France, but moſt of the crowned heads united in their perſons the rights of executing the laws, of enacting thoſe which they conceived neceſſary or conducive to the welfare of the State, and of judging thoſe who had infringed the law *.

The reunion of this Triple Power conſtitutes an *abſolute Monarch*; that is to ſay, a real Sovereign who in his perſon concentrates the whole power of the law. At that period the French were far from confounding this abſolute power with the arbitrary power of the Tyrant or the Deſpot. This power was to be found in Republics and in mixt States. Here it exiſted in the Senate, or in the aſſembly of Deputies; there in the compound of the Senate and the King. The French nation beheld it in their Monarch, whoſe ſupreme will, legally proclaimed, was the utmoſt degree of political authority.

* Chap. 6, Book XI.

This

Difference between an abſolute and an arbitrary power.

This ſupreme will, conſtrued into law by the requiſite forms, was equally binding on the King and on his ſubjects. It is not only Henry IV. and his Miniſter Sully, who declare *that the firſt law of the Sovereign is to obſerve them all*; but it is Lewis XIV. that Prince whom the Sophiſters affectedly ſtyle the Deſpot, who at the height of his glory openly proclaims this obligation in his edicts: "Do not let it be ſaid," are his words, "that the "Sovereign ſhall not be ſubject to the laws of the "ſtate. The rights of nations proclaim the con- "trary truth, which has ſometimes been attacked "by flattery, but which all good Princes have de- "fended as the guardian of their ſtates. How "much more accurate it is to ſay, that to conſti- "tute the perfect happineſs of a kingdom, it is "neceſſary that the Prince ſhould be obeyed by "his ſubjects, *that the Prince ſhould obey the Laws*, "and that thoſe laws ſhould be juſt and directed "to the public good *!"

This obligation alone in the Sovereign immediately deſtroys all deſpotic or arbitrary power.—For, in the idiom of modern languages, the Deſpot is the man who rules only by his paſſions and caprice; under whom no ſubject can be at eaſe, as he is ignorant whether his maſter will not puniſh

* Edict of Lewis XIV. 1667; alſo the Treatiſe of the Queen's Rights on Spain.

him

him to-day for having executed the orders he had received from him yeſterday.

In ſhort, it may be juſtly ſaid, that Political Liberty conſiſts in two points: 1ſt, That every Citizen ſhould be free to do all that is not forbidden by the law: 2dly, That the law ſhould preſcribe or forbid any particular action for the public good only. Experience will vouch for the correctneſs of this definition. And where could the honeſt and upright man, obedient to the laws of his country, enjoy greater ſecurity and freedom than he did in France?

It may indeed, be objected, that there exiſted many abuſes, but did they not originate from the genius of the French, or from an exceſs rather than a want of liberty? Were the conſpirators to exclaim againſt the immoral and impious Miniſter for having abuſed the power with which he was entruſted, when theſe Sophiſters had during many years conſpired againſt the morals and piety of the whole nation? No; they had no right to complain that the law was often ſacrificed to private paſſions; the exact obſervance of the law ſhould have been their prayer, but they only ſought after ruin and revolution.

Of *Lettres de Cachet*, and of their abuſe.

One real abuſe had crept into the French Government, which favoured much of Deſpotiſm.— This was the uſe of *Lettres de Cachet*. Undoubtedly they were illegal. On a bare order from the King

King the ſubject loſt his liberty. I will not defend ſuch an abuſe by ſaying, that none but the higher claſſes or ſeditious writers were expoſed to the effect of this arbitrary power. But, perhaps, few are acquainted with the origin of thoſe Letters. It was to the moral character of the French, and to the notions particularly of the higher claſſes, that this abuſe owed its origin; and it was neceſſary either to do away thoſe notions, or to leave ſo formidable a power in the hands of the Monarch.

Such was the received opinion in France, that a family would have thought itſelf diſhonored, if any child, brother, or near relation were brought to juſtice. Hence it was that families, fearing the arm of the law, applied to the King to obtain an order to impriſon any profligate youth whoſe irregular conduct might diſgrace the family. If any hopes of reformation could be conceived, the *Lettre de Cachet* was only temporary, and ſerved as a correction; but where the offence was criminal and infamous, the culprit was impriſoned for life.

The reader muſt not be miſled to ſuppoſe, that theſe Letters were granted on a mere requeſt and without any inquiry into the caſe. After Mr. de Maleſherbe's adminiſtration, the Petitions ſent to the King were tranſmitted to the Intendant of the Province, who immediately ordered his ſub-delegate to call a meeting of the relations and witneſſes, and to take minutes of their pro-

proceedings. On theſe informations, which were forwarded to the Miniſters, his Majeſty granted or refuſed the *Lettre de Cachet* *.

Under ſuch reſtrictions it was evidently rather the authority of a common parent, which the King exerciſed over his ſubjects, than that of a deſpot enſlaving them. With the notions which the French nation had adopted, it was the neceſſary means of preſerving the honour of different families; and few were victims to this authority but thoſe who were dangerous either to private or public ſociety. From the uſe to the abuſe of a thing, however, the diſtance is but ſmall: a profligate miniſter might exerciſe this power againſt the ci-

* Although theſe *Lettres de Cachet* did not generally regard the commonalty, yet the king, when petitioned, did not always refuſe them to the lower claſſes. I was once ordered to attend one of thoſe meetings as interpreter for an honeſt German, who, though low in life, had requeſted his Majeſty to grant a *Lettre de Cachet* for his wife, who, violent and choleric, had attempted to ſtab him, but fortunately he had ſtopped her hand. The poor man, unable to live in peace or ſafety with this woman, and unwilling to bring her before a tribunal, had recourſe to the King, who ordered the Intendant to take all the proper evidence. The relations and witneſſes were ſecretly aſſembled. I ſaw the Subdelegate examine the facts with the greateſt humanity. The whole being verified, the minutes were laid before his Majeſty, and the *Lettre de Cachet* granted. The lady was confined; but in a few months ſhe was permitted to return, and was ever after a model of gentleneſs and ſubmiſſion.

tizen or the magiſtrate who had fulfilled his duty with the greateſt integrity. Nor was it unexampled, that a miniſter, ſolicited by powerful men, rather conſulted their private animoſities, than public juſtice, or general utility. But a profligate miniſter abuſing his authority does not make his King a deſpot. The morals of the higher claſſes being perverted, as we have ſeen, by Philoſophiſm, the abuſe of this prerogative might loudly call for reform; but are the Sophiſters thence juſtifiable in ſeeking to overthrow the Monarchy?

The French attached to their King, at the time the Spirit of Laws was publiſhed.

In ſhort, whatever may have been the cauſe of theſe abuſes at the period when *the Spirit of Laws* appeared, it had never entered the minds of Frenchmen, that they lived under a deſpotic government. Let us hear Jean Jaques Rouſſeau lay down the law, he who created ſyſtems to overthrow it; and let the candid reader judge how far the Sophiſters are authorized to repreſent the French government as arbitrary, oppreſſive, and tyrannical. "What, (ſays Jean Jaques), is the true end of a "political aſſociation? Is it not the preſervation "and proſperity of its members? And what is "the moſt certain ſign that they are preſerved, "and that they proſper? Is it not the increaſing population? We need ſeek no further "for the ſign in diſpute; but pronounce that "government to be infallibly the beſt (provided "there is no particular circumſtance to make it "ſtand an exception to a general rule) under

"which,

"which, without the application of any improper "means, without the naturalization of ſtrangers, "without receiving any new coloniſts, the citizens "increaſe and multiply: and that to be the worſt "under which they leſſen and decay. Calcula- "tors, it is now your affair; count, meaſure and "compare them *." The ſame author adds, "It "is a long continuance in the ſame ſituation that "makes proſperity or calamity real. When a "whole nation lies cruſhed under the foot of "deſpotiſm, it is then that the people periſh; "and it is then that their maſters can hurl de- "ſtruction among them with impunity, *ubi ſolitu- "dinem faciunt, pacem appellant* (and call peace, "the ſilence of the deſert they have created). "When the factions of the chief men of France "had ariſen to ſuch a height as to agitate the "kingdom, and the coadjutor of Paris judged it "neceſſary to carry a dagger in his pocket every "time he went into the parliament, the French "people lived free and at eaſe, they were happy "and their numbers increaſed. The proſperity "of a nation and its population depends much "more *on liberty* than on peace †".

Thus, without taking on himſelf the taſk of calculator, Jean Jaques confeſſes that the French people, even in the midſt of civil broils, *lived free*

* Social Contract, Chap. 9, Book III. † Ib. in the note.

and at eaſe. But let us attend to one of his moſt faithful diſciples, who undertook to calculate, and that at a time when the revolution had done away every idea of exaggerating the happineſs of the French people under the government of their Kings. The revolutioniſt Gudin, in his annotations on the above text, and in his Supplement to the Social Contract, has examined and calculated, year by year, the ſtate of the population, the deaths, births, and marriages of all the principal towns in the kingdom during the courſe of this century, and then proceeds: "The author of the "Social Contract ſpoke a grand truth when he "exclaimed: Calculators, it is now your affair; "*count, meaſure* and *compare.* His advice has "been followed; we have calculated, meaſured, "and compared, and the reſult of all theſe calcu-"lations has demonſtrated that the population of "France is really twenty-four millions, though it "had always been ſuppoſed to be under twenty; "that the annual births amount to one million; "and *that the population is daily increaſing.*

"Hence we may conclude, after Rouſſeau, that "the government was very good. It really was "better than it ever had been at any period ſince "the deſtruction of that which the Romans had "eſtabliſhed in Gaul." Such are the words of the ſame author, and according to his calculations it was *in the reign of Lewis XIV,* whom the Sophiſters

ſters repreſent as the haughtieſt of deſpots, *that the population of France began to increaſe regularly and univerſally throughout the whole kingdom,* notwithſtanding all his wars.

" The long reign of Lewis XV. (another al-
" ledged deſpot, under whoſe reign the Antimo-
" narchical Conſpiracy was begun and indefatiga-
" bly conducted) was not expoſed to ſuch cala-
" mities; and it is certain, continues the revolu-
" tioniſt Gudin, that during the whole monarchy
" there has exiſted no period when population in-
" creaſed in a more conſtant and uniform progreſ-
" ſion throughout the whole kingdom, than during
" that reign. It increaſed to that amazing height,
" that from twenty-four to twenty-five millions of
" ſouls were ſpread over a ſurface of twenty-five
" thouſand ſquare leagues, which makes about
" a million of ſouls to a thouſand ſquare leagues,
" or a thouſand inhabitants to every ſquare league,
" *a population ſo unparalleled in Europe, that it*
" *might be almoſt looked upon as a prodigy.*"

Let us hear the ſame author on the ſtate of France at the time when the Revolution broke out, which he is perpetually extolling; and let us remark, that the work whence we have extracted our documents was ſo acceptable to the Revolutionary Aſſembly, that by a particular degree of the 13th of November 1790, *it accepted the homage of it*: a ſtronger contraſt cannot be ſketched be-

tween that Revolution and its authors, whether diſtant or immediate, and the neceſſity of thoſe plans by which they pretended to work the happineſs of the Empire. The ſame author continues:

" The French territory is ſo well cultivated, " that its annual produce is eſtimated at four thou- " ſand millions.

" Its currency amounted to two thouſand two " hundred millions, and the gold and ſilver em- " ployed in plate and jewels may be eſtimated at " a ſimilar amount.

" The Records of the Affinage Office in Paris " atteſt, that the annual conſumption or rather " waſte of refined gold, in gilding furniture, car- " riages, paſteboard, china, nails, fans, buttons, " books, in ſpotting ſtuffs, or in plating ſilver, " amounted to the enormous ſum of eight hun- " dred thouſand livres.

" The profit on trade was annually computed " at between forty and fifty millions.

" The taxes paid by the people did not exceed " ſix hundred and ten or twelve millions, which " does not amount to one third of the circulating " medium, nor to one ſixth part of the groſs " territorial produce, and which probably cannot " be computed at more than one third of the " neat produce, a ſum which in that proportion

" could

" could not have been exorbitant if every one had " paid according to his means *.

" In this kingdom were annually born upwards " of 928,000 children; in ſhort, nearly a million. " The town of Paris contained 666,000 inhabit- " ants. Its riches were ſo great, that it paid an- " nually one hundred millions into the King's

* As this laſt ſentence alludes to the privileges and exemptions of the Clergy and Nobility, I cannot but refer my reader to a work attributed to Mr. Senac de Meilhan, and which is very ſatisfactory on this point. It contains the following paſſage: " Mr. Necker at length, in a moment of pique " againſt his ungrateful children, diſcloſed the whole truth, " and declared before the National Aſſembly, that the ex- " emptions of the Clergy and Nobility, which had been re- " preſented in ſo odious a light, did not exceed ſeven millions " of livres (318,181l.) that the half of that ſum belonged to " the privileged perſons of the *Tiers Etat*—and that the tax " on enregiſtering, *(droit de contrôle)* which only bore on " the two firſt orders, amply balanced the privileges they " enjoyed with regard to the ordinary taxes. Theſe me- " morable words were ſpoken in the face of all Europe, but " were drowned in the cries of the victorious demagogues. " The Clergy, the Nobility, and the Monarchy, all have " periſhed,"—and periſhed under the pretence of an inequality of privileges (an empty aſſertion), which was more than amply compenſated by a ſingle tax on the privileged orders. This was the tax on all public acts. It was rated in proportion to the ſum ſpecified in the act, or to the *titles inſerted*. " Thus the Moſt High and Puiſſant Lord, Marquis, Count " or Baron, was rated according to his birth, or rank, while " a citizen only paid in the ratio of his obſcurity." *Vid. that work, and note to chap.* 6.

" coffers, about one ſixth of the whole taxation " of France.

" But even this immenſe taxation did not over- " burthen Paris. Its inhabitants lived in affluence. " If its daily conſumption amounted to one mil- " lion, at leaſt from eighty to one hundred mil- " lions were neceſſary for its interior circula- " tion.

" In ſhort, calculators have eſtimated, that " during the reign of Lewis XV. *the population of* " *the country was increaſed by one ninth*, that is to " ſay, by two millions five or ſix hundred thou- " ſand ſouls.

" Such was the ſtate of France and of Paris " at the time the revolution took place; and as " no other ſtate in Europe could exhibit ſuch a " population, nor boaſt of ſuch revenues, it was " not without reaſon that *it paſſed for the firſt* " *kingdom on the Continent.*"

Supplement to the Social Contract. See note *Population.*

The revolutioniſt Gudin, to whom we are indebted for all theſe particulars, concludes by ſaying, " I thought it neceſſary to ſtate in a pre- " ciſe and exact manner the population and riches " of the kingdom at the period when *ſo grand a* " *revolution took place.* I apprehended that this " inveſtigation would ſhew the future progreſs of " the nation, and ſerve as a table by which we " might calculate the advantages that will accrue " from the conſtitution when brought to perfec- " tion."

" tion." Without doubt our author has by this time formed his opinion on the advantages of that conſtitution; but we can plainly ſee by his enthuſiaſtic admiration of the revolution, and of the Philoſophers to whom he attributes the honor of having effected it *, that he was very far from wiſhing to exaggerate the liberty and happineſs of France under the Monarchy. By the foregoing long extract we have no other object in view, than that of furniſhing the hiſtorian with the proper materials (all extracted from the greateſt admirers or chief authors of the French Revolution) to enable him to judge of thoſe ſyſtems in which the Revolution originated, and to appreciate properly the wiſdom or the imprudence of its authors.—But to return to Monteſquieu.

Preciſely at that period when *L'Eſprit des Loix* was publiſhed, the French were ſo happy and ſo pleaſed with their King, that the ſurname of *well-beloved (bien aimé)* had reſounded from one extremity of the nation to the other. And, unfortunately for Monteſquieu, it is from this publication that we are to trace all thoſe Philoſophical reveries on Liberty and Equality, which at firſt only produced diſquiet and doubt, but which ſoon after created other ſyſtems, that miſled the French people in their ideas on government, that weakened the

* Book III. Chap. on the Philoſophers.

tie

tie of affection between the ſubject and the monarch, and generated at length the monſter of Revolutions.

There is an eſſential difference to be perceived between Voltaire and Monteſquieu. Voltaire, as we have ſhown, would willingly have endured a Monarch that ſhould have connived at his impiety. He would have thought himſelf ſufficiently free, had he been allowed publicly to blaſpheme; and, generally ſpeaking, he was more partial to the forms of Monarchy, or of Ariſtocracy, than to thoſe of Democracy. It was his hatred to religion (and he hated religion more than he loved Kings) which plunged him into the municipalizing ſyſtem.

His admiration for foreign laws. His ſyſtems inapplicable to his country.

With Monteſquieu it was far otherwiſe. Though he was not indifferent on the ſubject of religious liberty, it was nevertheleſs Monarchy itſelf that he meant to inveſtigate. He propoſed to regulate all kingly power and authority according to his ideas of political liberty. Had religious liberty been carried to exceſs, ſtill he would have looked upon himſelf as immerſed in ſlavery in every ſtate where the public authority was not ſubdivided, according to his ſyſtem, into three diſtinct powers, *the Legiſlative, the Executive, and the Judiciary.* This diſtinction was new to the French nation, which had been accuſtomed to view its Monarch as the central point of all political authority.

thority. The peaceful ages they had paſſed under their Legiſlative Kings little inclined them to envy the boiſterous liberty of a neighbouring country, perhaps more celebrated for its civil broils in queſt of liberty, than for the wiſdom of its conſtitution, which, at length fixing every mind and every heart, had ſcarcely terminated a long ſtruggle between the Monarch and the People.

Without doubt we may admire, as much as Monteſquieu, the wiſdom of that nation which has known how to model its laws according to the experience it had acquired during thoſe ſtruggles. Laws, indeed, congenial to the manners which characterize it, to its local ſituation, and even to its prejudices. But is that conſtitution, the moſt perfect perhaps exiſting for a nation ſurrounded by the ocean, to be equally perfect when tranſplanted into a continental ſtate? Has not nature, by diverſifying the ſoil, varied its culture? Are men, ſo heterogeneous in their characters, men that may be viewed under ſo many different points, are they, in order to attain happineſs and freedom, to be reduced to one only mode of government? No; it would have been madneſs to adopt the Engliſh conſtitution in France. The genius of the French nation muſt have been totally changed before a Frenchman would believe himſelf free where the Engliſhman does not even perceive the yoke of the law; before the former would refrain from abuſing

abuſing that liberty which the latter will ſcarcely taſte of; and particularly before the Frenchman could be kept within thoſe limits where the Engliſhman reſts content.

We are willing to believe, that Monteſquieu had never made theſe reflections, when, carried away by his admiration for foreign laws, he was inventing new principles, and preſenting as conſtant and general ſuch truths, as would make his countrymen view their Sovereign in the light of a real Deſpot, and the mild government they lived under, though ſo conformable to their intereſts and their genius, as that of a moſt horrid and ſhameful ſlavery.

His ſyſtems alienate the French from their King.

It is painful to apply ſuch a reproach to this celebrated writer; but can hiſtory refrain from obſerving the fatal impreſſion which ſuch doctrines muſt have made on a people ſo long accuſtomed to ſay, *ſi veut le Roi, ſi veut la loi*, (as the King wills, ſo wills the law); the doctrines, I ſay, of him who dared aſſert as a demonſtrated truth, that "when the legiſlative and executive powers are "united in the ſame perſon or in the ſame body "of magiſtrates, there can be no liberty; be-"cauſe apprehenſions may ariſe leſt the ſame "Monarch or Senate ſhould enact tyrannical laws, "to execute them in a tyrannical manner *." But

in laying down this principle he had taken care to ſay immediately before, " the political liberty of " the ſubject is a tranquillity of mind, ariſing " from the opinion which each one has of his " ſafety. In order to have this liberty, it is re- " quiſite that the Government be ſo conſtituted, " as that one man need not be afraid of ano- " ther*."

Either Monteſquieu muſt have believed the French reader incapable of uniting theſe two ideas, or elſe he meant to ſay, " Frenchmen! You believe that under the government of your King you are in ſafety, and enjoy liberty. Your opinion is erroneous, it is ſhameful. Amidſt that calm which you ſeem to enjoy *there is no liberty*; and none can exiſt ſo long as you repeat *ſi veut le Roi, ſi veut la loi*; in ſhort, ſo long as the Legiſlative and Executive Powers are united in the perſon of your King. He muſt be deprived either of the one or the other; or elſe you muſt ſubmit to live in the perpetual terror of *tyrannical laws, tyrannically executed.*"

This language is not held out to the French alone, but to every people governed by Kings, even to moſt Republics, where, as he himſelf remarks, theſe powers were often united. The whole univerſe was then in a ſtate of ſlavery, and

* Chap. 6, Book XI.

Mon-

Monteſquieu was the apoſtle ſent to teach them to break their chains, chains ſo light that few were even ſenſible of their exiſtence! A general Revolution was then neceſſary, that mankind might aſſert its liberty! I could wiſh to exculpate Monteſquieu; but if on the one ſide I am afraid of attributing intentions to him which he never had, on the other I dare not revile genius by ſeparating it from reaſon; by ſaying that he had laid down new principles without even perceiving their moſt immediate conſequences. It is a hard taſk to repreſent Monteſquieu brandiſhing the torch of diſcord between nations and their Kings, between the ſubjects even of Republics and their Senates, or their Magiſtrates; but would it not be ſomething more or leſs than kindneſs, to behold the torch, and the man who wields it, without daring to intimate the intention of kindling a blaze? How chimerical muſt have been that terror of tyrannical laws tyrannically executed, in a country where the legiſlator himſelf is bound by pre-exiſting laws, whoſe ſole object is the preſervation of property, liberty, and the ſafety of the ſubject!—What a phantom ſuch a ſuppoſition muſt be in a country where the King was omnipotent in the love of his ſubjects, and null in tyranny; in a country where, if the repreſentations of the Magiſtrates were inſufficient, the Monarch could never reſiſt thoſe of the people, whoſe very ſilence was ſuffi-

ſufficient to diſarm him, and he would abrogate any number of laws to make them return to their noiſy acclamations. Monteſquieu, who attributes ſo much influence to climates, might very well have taken into conſideration the manners, the character, and the received opinions, acting ſo much more powerfully among his countrymen than in any other nation. But the fact was, that the French laws enacted by their Legiſlative Monarchs were not to be ſurpaſſed either in wiſdom or mildneſs by the laws of any country; under thoſe Legiſlative Kings they had ſeen their liberties, ſo far from being contracted, aſcertained and extended, and facts are better authorities than ſyſtems *.

His errors on the Judiciary Power.

The ſame error, the ſame deluſion ſhows itſelf when Monteſquieu believes every thing to be ruined, if the Prince who has enacted a law has the power of judging the man who tranſgreſſes it. Such a fear might be reaſonable in a country

* On this occaſion we may cite Mr. Garat, a lawyer, whoſe opinion cannot be miſtruſted, having with many other of his brethren diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his philoſophical zeal for the Revolution; and before that period he was one of the moſt obſtinate ticklers for the ſovereignty of the people.—Nevertheleſs he ſays, "at preſent all laws emanate from the "ſupreme will of the Monarch, who no longer has the whole "nation for his council. But his throne is ſo eaſy of acceſs, "that the wiſhes of the nation can always reach it." *Garat's Repert: de jurisprud. art* SOUVERAIN.

where

where the Legiſlative Monarch could be both judge and plaintiff, thus ſitting in judgment on his own cauſe, and over thoſe of his ſubjects of whom he might have reaſon to complain; or where the Legiſlative King becomes ſole Magiſtrate and ſole Judge, or violates the accuſtomed forms requiring a certain number of Magiſtrates and votes to condemn or abſolve a ſubject. This was a chimerical terror in every true Monarchy, where, as in France, the firſt law is to obſerve thoſe of nature, which will always preclude either Sovereign or Magiſtrate from ſitting in judgment on their own cauſes, and on their private differences with the ſubject. A terror ſtill more futile wherever, as in France, the King might be caſt in his own tribunals, and where equally with any ſubject he was bound by the law. Hence nothing could ever have made the French unite the idea of Deſpotiſm to that of a Monarch the judge of his ſubjects. With what romantic ideas and tender affection they were wont to paint thoſe happy days when Lewis IX. ſurrounded by his ſubjects as if they had been his children, would, under a ſhady oak, hear and determine their differences, with all the authority and juſtice of the firſt magiſtrate of his kingdom *! How new muſt it then have been for the people to hear Monteſquieu aſſert, that "there

* See Joinville's Memoirs.

"is

" is no liberty, if the power of judging be not " ſeparated from the Legiſlative and Executive " Powers! Were it joined with the Legiſlative, " the life and liberty of the ſubject would be ex- " poſed *to arbitrary control*, for the Judge would " then be the Legiſlator. Were it joined to the " Executive Power, the Judge might behave with " all the violence of an oppreſſor. There would " be an end of every thing, were the ſame man, " or the ſame body, whether of the Nobles or of " the people, to exerciſe thoſe three powers, that " of enacting laws, that of executing the public " reſolutions, and that of judging the crimes, or " determining the diſputes of individuals *."

Monteſquieu appears to have felt the danger of ſuch leſſons, when he really ſeeks to conſole nations by telling them, that " moſt kingdoms in " Europe enjoy a moderate government, becauſe " the Prince who is inveſted with the firſt two " powers leaves the third to his ſubjects." But ſuch a diſtinction can little avail; of what conſequence can it be, that the Prince ſhould leave this third power to his ſubjects, when about twenty lines higher Monteſquieu has laid down as a conſtant principle, that when the two firſt powers are united in the ſame perſon *there can be no Liberty?* And why does he immediately add, " In Turkey,

Chap. 6, Book XI.

" where theſe three powers are united in the Sul-
" tan's perſon, the ſubjects groan under the weight
" of the moſt frightful oppreſſion *? Is it not very well known, that the Sultan generally leaves the judiciary power to the tribunals? Could the illuſtrious author have meant to addreſs his countrymen in ſaying, " You who in every age of
" your hiſtory behold your Kings exerciſing this
" power, ſuch as Hugues Capet judging Arnould
" de Rheims; as Lewis the Younger, the Biſhop
" of Langres, and the Duke of Burgundy; as
" Lewis IX. adminiſtering juſtice to all thoſe of
" his ſubjects who had recourſe to him; as
" Charles V. judging the Marquis of Saluces, or
" Charles VII. condemning the Duke of Alen-
" çon; as Francis I. pronouncing on the Conne-
" table de Bourbon, and Lewis XIII. judging the
" Duke de la Valette; in fine, all you, I ſay, who
" behold your Monarchs exerciſing the judiciary
" power, learn that there was *an end of every thing*
" under ſuch Princes, who were real Sultans, by
" whom the ſubject was made to groan under the
" moſt *frightful deſpotiſm*, and that you are in dan-
" ger of ſeeing it revived every time your Kings
" ſhall exerciſe the ſame powers †."

Would

* Chap. 6, Book XI.

† It might be objected, that ſome of the Kings, as in the caſe of Francis I. who ſat in judgment on trials for High Treaſon were judges in their own cauſe. But in reality thoſe are cauſes

Would it not have been wiſer and more correct if Monteſquieu had ſaid, that what conſtituted the deſpotic power in the Sultan was the power of capriciouſly and inſtantaneouſly pronouncing on all points, following no other guide but his paſſion and his momentary intereſt? He ſends the bowſtring and it is an order to die; but can ſuch an order be deemed a judgment. He ſends it becauſe he wills it, little regarding the letter or deciſions of the law; and it little imports whether ſuch a will be aſſented to by a ſenate which may bear the title of judges, or whether he wills it alone, and in direct oppoſition to ſuch a body of Magiſtrates. Such is the power which creates a Sultan, and which conſtitutes Deſpotiſm. But is it not chimerical to ſuppoſe, that in France the power of making a law and then pronouncing according to the deciſions of that law antecedently made and promulgated, could conſtitute Deſpotiſm?

cauſes which intereſt the whole ſtate. It might as well be objected, that a French Parliament could not judge a traitor to the ſtate, becauſe it is the cauſe of every Frenchman. This was an objection made againſt Francis I. in the caſe of the Marquis de Saluces. It was quaſhed by the Attorney General. But its having been made is ſufficient to prove that the King was no deſpot, ſince the laws of the country, and a court of juſtice were to decide, whether he could exerciſe his power in that particular caſe.—*(Repert: de Juriſprud. art.* ROY, *par M. Polverel.)*

This erroneous aſſertion of ſo celebrated a writer is the more extraordinary, as we find it fully refuted in that part of his work where he treats of thoſe ancient Dukes and Counts who, under the ancient government of the Franks, exerciſed, the three powers. " It may be imagined perhaps, " (he ſays) that the government of the Franks " muſt have been very ſevere at that time, ſince " the ſame officers were inveſted with a military " and a civil power, nay, even with a fiſcal " power over the ſubjects, which in the pre- " ceding books I have obſerved to be diſtin- " guiſhing marks of Deſpotic Authority. But it " is not to be believed, that the Counts pronoun- " ced judgment by themſelves, and adminiſtered " juſtice in the ſame manner as the Baſhaws do in " Turkey. In order to judge affairs, they aſ- " ſembled a kind of aſſizes where the principal " men appeared. The Count's aſſiſtants were " generally ſeven in number; and as he was " obliged to have twelve perſons to judge, he " filled up the number with the principal men. " But whoever had the juriſdiction, whether the " King, the Count, the *Grafio*, the *Centenarian*, " the Lords, or the Clergy, they never judged " alone; and this uſage, which derived its origin " from the foreſts of Germany, (as alſo did the *beautiful ſyſtem* of the admirable conſtitution), " was ſtill continued even after the fiefs had aſ-

" ſumed

" ſumed a new form*. He was not then to come and tell the French people, whoſe Kings did not judge alone in modern more than they had done in former times, that *all was over with them*, that Liberty was at an end, becauſe the judiciary power was not ſeparated from the legiſlative and executive powers.

Further error which begets the States-General.

It is eaſy to ſee what diſquiet ſuch principles muſt have created in the minds of his country-men, and how they expoſed the Royal Authority to odium and miſtruſt. But, alas! this work contains the origin of far greater evils.

Forewarned by experience of the troubles which accompanied the States-General, the French ſeldom recalled them to mind but to enjoy the peace and glory they had acquired under Monarchs, who by their wiſdom had ſupplied the want of thoſe ancient States. Monteſquieu not only ſpread his falſe alarms on the legiſlative and executive powers of the Sovereign, but he was unfortunate enough to lay down as law to the people, that every ſtate that wiſhes to believe itſelf free muſt only confide in itſelf, or its repreſentatives, for the enacting of its laws. He was the firſt who ſaid, " *As in a free* " *State every man, who is ſuppoſed a free agent,* " *ought to be his own governor,* ſo the legiſlative " power ought to reſide in the whole body of the

" people. But ſince this is impoſſible in large " States, and in ſmall ones is ſubject to great in- " conveniences, *it is fit that the people ſhould exe-* " *cute by their Repreſentatives what they cannot* " *execute by themſelves* *."

This is not the place to obſerve what a multitude of errors theſe aſſertions contain: the chief is that of having converted into a principle what he had obſerved in England, without conſidering that often what has conducted one nation to Liberty, may lead another into all the horrors of Anarchy, and thence to Deſpotiſm. On ſeeing this opinion laid down as a general principle, the French believed, that to become a free ſtate it was neceſſary for them to return to their former States-General, and veſt them with the legiſlative power. And in order to throw the fiſcal power alſo into their hands Monteſquieu adds, " If the legiſlative power " were to ſettle the ſubſidies, not from year to " year, but for ever, *it would run the riſk of loſing* " *its Liberty*, becauſe the executive power would " no longer be dependent; and when once it was " poſſeſſed of ſuch a perpetual right, it would be " a matter of indifference, whether it held it of " itſelf, or of another. The ſame may be ſaid, " if it ſhould fix, not from year to year, but for " ever, the ſea and land forces with which it is to " entruſt the executive power †."

* Chap. 6, Book XI. † Ibid.

When

When we conſider how little ſuch a doctrine was ever thought of in France before Monteſquieu had written; when we behold that ſwarm of ſcribbling copyiſts, who all repeat that Liberty is at an end wherever the people do not exerciſe the legiſlative and fiſcal powers, either by themſelves or by their repreſentatives; when we compare this doctrine with that of the firſt revolutionary rebels, whether under the denomination of *Conſtitutionaliſts* or *Monarchiſts*; when we reflect that it was on ſuch principles that Necker, Turgot, Barnave, Mirabeau, and La Fayette founded their ſyſtematic rebellion, do we not immediately infer (an awful truth indeed for Monteſquieu, but which Hiſtory can never hide), that it is to Monteſquieu the French muſt trace that ſyſtem which disjoints the ſceptre and throws the Monarch into the hands of the people, who by means of their repreſentatives proclaim their pretended laws; that ſyſtem which recalls the States-General, who, ſoon ſtyling themſelves National Aſſembly, leave nothing to their King but the theatrical ſhow of royal pageantry, until, carrying their conſequences ſtill further, the people aſſert their unbounded ſovereignty by dragging the unfortunate Lewis XVI. to the ſcaffold.

Hiſtory will be aſtoniſhed when it beholds Monteſquieu, ignorant of his ſyſtem having been preciſely that which the moſt inveterate enemies

of his country had formerly adopted, in hopes of diminiſhing the luſtre and grandeur which it enjoyed under the dominion of its Kings. For ever will the memory of thoſe ſervile copyiſts, the Conſtitutionaliſts and Monarchiſts, be odious to their country, when it ſhall be remembered that their main object was to ſubject their Monarch to the authority of the States-General, and thus conſummate the very plan concerted by the foreign enemy.

His Syſtems coincide with thoſe of the greateſt enemies of the State.

All theſe wonderful men, who were ſo well verſed in the Engliſh conſtitution, might during their reſearches have learned what every Engliſh ſchool-boy was acquainted with, who, in his moſt tender years, on receiving Salmon's Geography muſt have read the following paſſage "January "16th, 1691, at the Congreſs of the Hague, "conſiſting of the Princes of Germany, the "Imperial, Engliſh, Italian, Spaniſh and Dutch "miniſters, a declaration was drawn up, wherein "they ſolemnly proteſted before God, that their "intentions were never to make peace with "Lewis XIV, until the Eſtates of the kingdom "of France ſhould be eſtabliſhed in their ancient "liberties; ſo that the Clergy, the Nobility, and "the Third-Eſtate, might enjoy their ancient "and lawful privileges; nor till their kings for "the future ſhould be obliged to call together "the ſaid eſtates *when they deſired any ſupply*, "without

" without whom they ſhould not raiſe any money,
" on any pretence whatever, and till the parlia-
" ments of that kingdom and *all other his ſubjects*
" *were reſtored to their juſt rights.* And the con-
" federates invited the ſubjects of France to
" join with them in this undertaking for reſtoring
" them to their *rights and liberties*, threatening
" ruin and devaſtation to thoſe who refuſed*."

It is thus that, after thirty years of the moſt learned diſcuſſion and reſearch on the part of Monteſquieu, and forty years of new diſcuſſion on the part of his learned diſciples, the Conſtitutionaliſts and Monarchiſts, that they adopt that plan for reſtoring their country to liberty which every Engliſh ſchool-boy knew to have originated in the mind of the enemy, who wiſhed to overturn the Throne, and tarniſh the luſtre which France had acquired under its Legiſlative Monarchs.

Had I already ſaid it, I ſhould nevertheleſs repeat, that the object here in debate is, not what the ancient conſtitution of France has been, nor whether their kings enjoyed the legiſlative power, (which has been very ill diſcuſſed by our modern politicians); ſtill leſs are we diſpoſed to agitate the queſtion, which is the moſt perfect conſtitution in itſelf? Nobody will deny that government to

* Edit. 1750. Page 309.

be

be the beſt, under which the people are happieſt at home, and moſt formidable abroad; and ſuch a reflection will ſuffice to ſhow how baneful the doctrines broached by Monteſquieu and repeated by the Sophiſters of Rebellion muſt have proved to France: They who came to ſtun their countrymen with the pretended fears of deſpotiſm, alienating their minds from their own conſtitution to excite their admiration for foreign laws, and that at a time when the love of the ſubjects for their King was carried to enthuſiaſm after the tranquil miniſtry of the Cardinal Fleury, and the brilliant campaigns of the Mareehal de Saxe in Flanders.

It may be difficult to decide how far this imprudent doctrine is to be looked upon as the error or as the perverſion of genius; were we to appeal to the teſtimonies of his greateſt admirers, we ſhould not heſitate at the latter deciſion, and rank him among the Sophiſters of Rebellion, as the ſect appears to have done. D'Alembert rather accuſes than defends him, when, anſwering thoſe who complained of the obſcurity of the *Spirit of Laws*, he ſays, "All that may appear "obſcure to common readers is not ſo to thoſe "whom the Author had particularly in view. "Beſide, *a voluntary obſcurity* ceaſes to be obſcure. "Mr. de Monteſquieu, often wiſhing to advance "certain important truths, which, boldly and "abſo-

" abſolutely expreſſed, might have given offence " to no purpoſe, *very prudently diſguiſed them, and* " *by this innocent artifice* hid them from thoſe who " might have been offended, without deſtroying " their intended effect on the ſage *." It is difficult to paſs over this *voluntary obſcurity* in a man who has advanced principles ſo ſubverſive of the laws and government of his country. His pretended *innocent artifices* would almoſt convince the reader, that all thoſe proteſtations of Monteſquieu were hypocritical and ſophiſtical, when we ſee him, after having ſtrained every nerve to prove to moſt nations that they are perfect ſtrangers to liberty, and that their kings are real deſpots, ſeeking every means to diſpel any ſuſpicion of his being of that diſquiet, moroſe, and ſeditious temper which thirſts after revolutions.

Nor is the ſuſpicion removed by D'Alembert when he compliments him as having " diffuſed " that general light on the principles of govern- " ment which has rendered the people more " attached *to what they ought to love.*" What can be the ſignification of " what they ought *to love*" in the mouth of this artful Sophiſter? Why ſhould he not have ſaid more attatched to their

* Monteſquieu's Elogy by D'Alembert at the head of the 5th volume of the Encyclopedia.

King

King and the Government of their country? But we have already ſeen how little this Sophiſter was attached to either the one or the other.

It is equally unfortunate, that his panegyriſt, now that the name of Encyclopediſt is ſo juſtly covered with opprobrium, ſhould extol his zeal for that monſtrous digeſt, whoſe object remains no longer a ſecret, or when the moſt revolutionary among the Sophiſters poſitively aſſert, that *Monteſquieu would not have written* had not Voltaire written before him. Condorcet, by advancing ſuch a propoſition, clearly means, that if Voltaire had not ſucceeded ſo well in his Anti-chriſtian Conſpiracy, Monteſquieu would not have contributed ſo powerfully towards the political revolution; that if the one had been leſs daring againſt the Altar, the other would have dared leſs againſt the Throne.

In ſolving this unfortunate problem, what "damning proof" would be acquired againſt Monteſquieu if the authenticity of a letter which appeared in one of the London papers could ever be aſcertained! Voltaire and D'Alembert conſpired againſt the Jeſuits, becauſe they believed that ſociety to be one of the firmeſt props to religion; Monteſquieu, if the letter be genuine, preſſes for their deſtruction, becauſe he thought them too much attached to the Royal authority.

"We

"We have a Prince," ſays he," who is good, but "weak. That ſociety employs every art to "transform the Monarch into a Deſpot. If it "ſucceeds: I tremble for the conſequences, civil "war will rage, and ſtreams of blood will inun- "date every part of Europe.—The Engliſh "writers have thrown ſo great a light upon "Liberty, and we have ſo great a deſire of pre- "ſerving what little of it we enjoy, that we "ſhould make the worſt ſlaves in the world."

Were thoſe violent and extreme meaſures which we have ſince witneſſed already taken? This letter would indicate as much; beſide, it is entirely written in the ſtyle of a conſpirator. It is full of ſuch expreſſions as theſe: "If we can- "not write freely, *let us think and act freely.* We "muſt wait patiently, but never ceaſe working "for the cauſe of Liberty. Since we cannot fly "to the pinnacle, let us climb."

Could it be poſſible that Monteſquieu had already formed the plan of driving out the Swiſs guards, and of calling forth the national guards of the revolution? The following lines ſtrongly denote ſuch a plan: "What a point ſhould we have "gained, if we could once get rid of thoſe mer- "cenaries and foreign ſoldiers! *An army of natives* "would declare for Liberty, at leaſt the greater "part of them would. But that is the very

"reaſon

"reaſon why foreign troops are maintained*." However difficult it may appear to vindicate Monteſquieu from being a conſpirator, if it be true that he was the Author of the above letter, ſtill I muſt ſay what may abſolutely excuſe him. This letter may have been written in a moment of anger, and be the effect of one of thoſe fantaſtical contradictions from which the greateſt genius is not always exempt. Monteſquieu had beſtowed the higheſt encomiums on the Jeſuits in his *Spirit of Laws* †; but that did not hinder them from condemning ſeveral of his propoſitions. The reſentment of the moment might have induced him to wiſh for their deſtruction. It is generally known, that he was much more tender to criticiſm than could be ſuppoſed for a man of

* It is earneſtly requeſted of all perſons who may have any further knowledge of that letter, or are in poſſeſſion of the Newſpaper in which it was publiſhed, that they will be kind enough to give ſuch information to the Author at Mr. Dulau's, Bookſeller, No. 107, Wardour-ſtreet. He cannot queſtion the veracity of the Abbé le Pointe, who gave him the tranſlation of it, taken from an Evening Newſpaper about the latter end of 1795; but, not attaching the ſame importance to the letter which the Author would have done, the Abbé neither remarked the title nor the date of the paper which he tranſlated it from, and *that* the Author hopes will plead his excuſe for troubling his readers.

his ſuperior genius. All his love of Liberty could not hinder him from applying to the Marquiſe de Pompadour to obtain the deſpotic order for ſuppreſſing and even for burning Mr. Dupin's Refutation of his Spirit of Laws *.

We may obſerve various traits in this celebrated genius which are irreconcileable. He was very intimate with the Encyclopedian Deiſts and Atheiſts, but always very deſirous that his friends ſhould die good Chriſtians, and that they ſhould receive all the rites of the church. At that awful period he was an Apoſtle or Divine, he would exhort and inſiſt until the ſick perſon aſſented; he would run, though it were at midnight, to call the clergyman whom he thought the moſt proper to complete the converſion; at leaſt ſuch was his conduct with reſpect to his friend and relation Mr. Meiran †.

His works are equally fantaſtical. He ſpeaks of religion in terms of the higheſt panegyric; nevertheleſs we have to guard againſt many an attack which he makes againſt it. In defending Chriſtianity againſt Bayle, he tells us, that perfect Chriſtians "would be citizens infinitely more enlightened with reſpect to the various duties of life. That the more they believed themſelves indebted to religion, the more they would think

* See Feller's Hiſtorical Dictionary. † Ibid.

"due

" due to their country; that the Principles of " Chriſtianity deeply engraved on the heart " ſhould be infinitely more powerful than the " falſe honour of Monarchies, than the human " virtues of Republics, or the ſervile fear of De- " ſpotic States *." And yet he lays aſide that religion, and continues to make this falſe honour and theſe human virtues the prime movers of Monarchies and Republics! He repreſents the Chriſtian religion as the moſt conſonant to Monarchy †; and he has ſaid before, " There is no " great ſhare of probity or virtue neceſſary to " ſupport a Monarchical Government—That in " well regulated Monarchies, they are almoſt all " good ſubjects, and very few good men—That " in a Monarchy it is extremely difficult for the " people to be virtuous ‡;" that is to ſay, that the Chriſtian religion is the moſt conſonant with Monarchies, but that it is the moſt difficult for the people to follow under that government. He writes in the midſt of a people then the moſt diſtinguiſhed for its love to its Sovereign, and his whole ſyſtem appears to be calculated for a nation enſlaved under the ſevereſt Deſpotiſm, and of which Terror is the prime agent. Certainly, either the beloved Monarch is not a Deſpot, or fear is not the prime agent of

* Chap. 6, Book XXIV. † Chap. 3. Book XXIV.
‡ Chap. 3 and 6. Book III.

Deſpotiſm.

Deſpotiſm. Might not all this be compriſed under what D'Alembert calls *innocent artifices?* but another cauſe may be ſurmiſed.

Monteſquieu declared in his laſt moments, that if he had hazarded any expreſſions in his works which could caſt a doubt on his belief, "it was "owing to a taſte for novelty and ſingularity; to "a wiſh of paſſing for a tranſcendent genius ſoaring above prejudice and common maxims; to a "deſire of pleaſing and of obtaining the plaudits "of thoſe men who directed the public opinion, "and who were never more laviſh of theirs than "when one appeared to authorize them to throw "off the yoke of all dependence and reſtraint*." This avowal would lead us to infer, that there was a greater taſte for novelty and ſingularity in his political ſyſtems than in his religious ideas. He always preſerved a ſufficiency of his religious education to reſpect Chriſtianity, though not enough to guard againſt thoſe political ſyſtems which might and really did gain him that applauſe which he ſo much ſought for, I mean that of the modern Sophiſters, who, with their new-fangled ideas of Liberty and Equality, thought themſelves authorized to ſhake off the yoke of all dependance. I cannot believe that he conſpired with them; but that he forwarded their plans is too certain. And

* See Hiſtorical Dictionary.

ſuch will be our opinion, till the before-mentioned letter can be authenticated *. He did not conſpire by ſetting up his ſyſtems, but his ſyſtems formed conſpirators. He created a ſchool, and in that ſchool ſyſtems were formed, which, improving on his, rendered the latter more fatal.

* It is certainly a moſt extraordinary coincidence, that while our Author, though obliged to ſtate the revolutionary principles laid down in Monteſquieu's works, does all he can to exculpate him from any evil intention, Bertrand Barrere, the ſanguinary Reporter of the ſucceſſive Committees of General Safety which have butchered France, and who was himſelf at length involved in the downfal of Robeſpierre, after having been his agent during his whole reign of terror, ſhould have been writing preciſely at the ſame time a long declamatory pamphlet under the title of *Monteſquieu peint par lui-meme*, claiming the honours of the Pantheon for him, as one of the Doctors of Democracy and a Progenitor of the French Revolution. He even declares his object to be no other than to form an Edition of Monteſquieu for the uſe of Republicans. Could it be poſſible that men of Barrere's ſtamp were the perſons whom D'Alembert meant to deſign when he ſaid, "All that may appear obſcure to common readers *is not ſo to* "*thoſe whom the author had particularly in view*; beſides, a "*voluntary obſcurity* ceaſes to be obſcure?" T.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Jean Jaques Rouſſeau's Syſtem.

HOWEVER cautiouſly Monteſquieu may have expreſſed himſelf, the grand principle of all Democratic Revolutions was nevertheleſs laid down in his writings. He had taught in his ſchool, "that in a free ſtate, every man who is ſuppoſed "a free agent ought *to be his own governor* *." This axiom evidently implies, that no man nor any people can believe themſelves free, unleſs they are their own legiſlators; and hence it was natural to conclude, that there hardly exiſted a nation on earth that had a right to believe itſelf free, or that had not ſome bonds to burſt in order to extricate itſelf from ſlavery.

Conſequences not obſerved, or paſſed over by Monteſquieu.

Scarcely could England even flatter itſelf with the real enjoyment of this liberty; and we ſee Monteſquieu not venturing to aſſert it when he adds, "It is not my buſineſs to examine whether the "Engliſh actually enjoy liberty or not. It is ſuf-"ficient for my purpoſe to obſerve, that it is "eſtabliſhed by their laws, and I inquire no far-"ther †." Though this may have ſatisfied the maſter, it might not be ſufficient for all the diſci-

* Chap. 6, Book XI. † Chap. 7, Book XI.

ples; and ſome one of them might anſwer, that according to his principle the Engliſh laws were far from granting that liberty inherent to a people governing itſelf.

It is evident, that to believe in their own freedom the Engliſh were obliged to deny this principle as too general, and certainly they were entitled to reply, "With us liberty conſiſts in the "right of freely doing all that the law does not "forbid; and every Engliſhman, whether rich "or poor, is equally free, whether he have the "requiſites for being an elector or not, whether "he make the law by his direct vote, or by his "deputies; or even if he does not in the leaſt "contribute toward it. For in all theſe caſes he "is certain of being judged by the ſame law. "The Foreigner even is as free among us as our-"ſelves, when he is willing to obſerve our laws, "for he may do as freely as ourſelves all that is "not forbidden by the law."

If England could juſtly reproach Monteſquieu with the generality of his principle, what muſt have been the caſe with other nations, ſuch as France, Spain, Germany, or Ruſſia, where the people do not partake, either by themſelves or by their repreſentatives, of the power of enacting laws? What was to be ſaid of all thoſe republics, either in Switzerland or Italy, where the three powers are united in the ſenate, where, to uſe Monteſ-

Monteſquieu's expreſſion, *the power being one*, he thinks *he diſcovers and dreads at every ſtep a Deſpotic Prince?*

It was a neceſſary conſequence, either that this principle muſt have been done away; or that all Europe, perſuading itſelf that it groaned under ſlavery, would attempt, by a general Revolution in all Governments, to caſt off the yoke. Some great genius muſt have ariſen who could have counteracted the fatal ſhock given by this illuſtrious author. But for the misfortune of Europe the very reverſe came to paſs.

Monteſquieu was not only admired and extolled, as he deſerved, in conſideration of many parts of his Spirit of Laws, but he was more eſpecially venerated for thoſe paſſages in which, by means of his principles on Liberty, Equality and Legiſlation, he aſperſed the exiſting governments with the imputation of Slavery. The Sophiſters eaſily overlooked his reſtrictions, his proteſtations, *his obſcurities and his innocent artifices*, becauſe they conceived it to be ſufficient that he had opened the path, and ſhown how far it might lead.

Jean Jaques following up Monteſquieu's principle, and more daring in his conſequences.

The firſt who undertook to widen this path was Jean Jaques Rouſſeau, that famous citizen of Geneva, whom we have already ſeen ſo powerfully forwarding the conſpiracy againſt the altar. He was in every ſhape the man of whom the Sophiſters of rebellion ſtood in need to conduct them in

in their attack againſt the Throne. Born a citizen of a Republic, he imbibed with his milk, as he ſays himſelf, *the hatred of Kings*, as Voltaire had done that of Chriſt. He was better verſed than Monteſquieu in that dangerous talent of propagating error with the tone of importance, or of preſenting paradox as the reſult of deep thought. He poſſeſſed, above all, that boldneſs which neither admits principles by halves, nor ſhrinks at their conſequences. He ſurpaſſed his maſter, and in his political theories greatly outſtripped him.

The *Spirit of Laws* appeared in the year 1748, and The *Social Contract* in 1752. Monteſquieu had revived the ideas of Liberty and Equality; but Jean Jaques conſtrues them into ſupreme happineſs. "If we examine," ſays he, "in what "the *ſupreme happineſs of* ALL conſiſts, which "ought to be the grand object of every legiſla- "ture, it will appear to center in theſe two points, "LIBERTY AND EQUALITY. In *Liberty*, becauſe "all private dependence is ſo much ſtrength ſub- "tracted from the body of the ſtate; in *Equality*, "becauſe Liberty cannot ſubſiſt without it *.

Man every where in ſlavery, according to Jean Jaques.

Monteſquieu had not dared to decide whether the Engliſh were free or not; and at the very time when he was paſſing the moſt ſevere criticiſm on other governments, he ſheltered himſelf under the

* Social Contract, Chap. 11, Book II.

inten-

intention of not wiſhing to *vilify* or *debaſe* any one. Jean Jaques was above ſuch cautions; he begins his work by ſaying, *Man is born free, and yet we ſee him every where in chains* *.

Monteſquieu had ſurmiſed, that to believe himſelf free it was neceſſary that *man ſhould be his own governor*; that he ſhould act according to his own laws, and according to his own will. But he judged the means of execution to be difficult in a ſmall ſtate, and impoſſible in a large one. Jean Jaques would have believed the principle falſe had he found it impoſſible in practice. But he believed the principle, as laid down by Monteſquieu to be true in theory; and to ſurpaſs his maſter he had only to demonſtrate its poſſibility, and to facilitate its execution. This conſtitutes his favorite problem:

Object of Jean Jaques's ſyſtem.

To find a form of aſſociation which "will de- "fend and protect with the whole aggregate force "the perſon and property of each individual; and "by which every perſon, while united with ALL, "*ſhall obey only* HIMSELF, *and remain as free as* "*before the union*;" ſuch is the fundamental "problem, ſays Jean Jaques, of which the Social "Contract gives the ſolution †." This was in other terms preciſely ſeeking to realize Monteſquieu's principle; to give to each man who feels

* Chap. 1, Book I. † Chap. 6, Book I.

himſelf a free agent the means of being his own governor, and of living under no other laws than thoſe which he has himſelf made.

His object erroneous.

How a man, after having entered into the Social Contract, is to find himſelf as free as if he had never engaged in it, is not eaſily conceived; or, how a man who has ſubjected himſelf to the will of the majority can be as free as when his actions were to be directed ſolely by his own will, is equally inconceivable. This was preciſely ſaying, that the object of civil ſociety is to preſerve that Liberty which is anterior to government, or of the ſtate of nature; though the Social Contract, according to all received ideas, expreſsly imports the ſacrifice of part of that Liberty to preſerve the reſt, and to obtain at that price, peace and ſecurity to one's perſon, property, and families; in ſhort, all the other advantages of civil ſociety.

The ſolution of this problem became more difficult when Jean Jaques aſſerted, that "it is evi- "dent, that the firſt wiſh and intention of the "people muſt be, that the ſtate ſhould not pe- "riſh *." According to their ſecond maxim, it was not eſſentially neceſſary to be one's own governor, or to act always according to one's own will, and to live under laws enacted by oneſelf; but to have good laws, whoever might have been

* Chap. 6, Book IV.

the

the legiſlator, and to be governed ſo as to ſave the State.

But contradictions could not thwart Jean Jaques in his career. He wiſhed to realize Monteſquieu's principle. He ſets off on the ſuppoſition, that every man, a free agent, is to be his own governor; that is to ſay, that every free people are to obey thoſe laws ſolely which they have themſelves enacted: and in future he never views the law in any other light than *as the act of the general will*. Such a propoſition immediately annuls all laws which had ever been enacted by any King, Prince, or Emperor, without the participation of the multitude; nor does Jean Jaques heſitate in ſaying, "It is unneceſſary to inquire to "whom belongs the function of making laws, be- "cauſe the laws are but the acts of the general "will. The legiſlative power belongs to the "people, and can belong only to them. What- "ever is ordered by *any* man of his own accord "is not law. For the people, to be ſubjected to "laws, muſt enjoy the right of making them *.

I. Conſequence. The people ſole legiſlator.

Such was the firſt principle which Jean Jaques deduced from his maſter's diſtinction of the three powers. The ſecond was not leſs flattering for the multitude. All Sovereignty, according to Jean Jaques, reſided in the power of Legiſlation.

II. The people ſovereign.

* Chap. 6, Book II.

In

In giving this power to the people, he concluded *the people were Sovereign*; and ſo much ſo, that they had not the power *of ſubmitting to another Sovereign.* All ſubmiſſion on the part of the people is repreſented in this new ſchool as a violation of the very act by which every people exiſts; and to violate this act was to annihilate their own exiſtence; and as a further conſequence he concludes, that all ſubmiſſion on the part of any people is *null* in itſelf, for this great reaſon, that *by nothing nothing can be performed* *.

Leſt he ſhould not be underſtood, we ſee Jean Jaques frequently repeating both the principle and the conſequences. "The Sovereignty, he "ſays, being no more than the exerciſe of the "general will, can never alienate itſelf. If there-"fore a people promiſe unconditionally to obey, "the act of making ſuch a promiſe diſſolves their "exiſtence, and they loſe their quality of a peo-"ple; for at the moment that there is a *maſter* "there is no longer a Sovereign, and the body "politic is deſtroyed of courſe †."

It was impoſſible to ſay in a clearer manner to all nations, Hitherto you have been governed by Kings whom you looked upon as Sovereigns; if you wiſh to ceaſe being ſlaves, begin by taking the Sovereignty to yourſelves, that you may enact

* Chap. 7. Book I. † Chap. 1. Book II.

your

your own laws; and let your Kings, if you wiſh to keep them, be no more than ſervants, to obey your laws, and to ſee them obſerved by others.

III. The people infallible in their laws.

Monteſquieu feared that a legiſlative people would not be ſufficiently enlightened for the diſcuſſion of laws and affairs in general; but this fear had not made him relinquiſh the principle. Jean Jaques, inſiſting on the principle, could ſee nobody more proper than the people to carry both principle and conſequence into practice. In this new ſyſtem, the general will of the people was not only to frame the laws, but in the making of thoſe laws became infallible. For he ſays, "the gene-" ral will is always right, and tends always to the " public advantage. The people can never be bribed, yet they may be deceived *." But in whatever manner they may be deceived, this *Sovereign people, by its nature, muſt, while it exiſts, be every thing that it ought to be* †.

IV. Sole repreſentative.

To compenſate for the incapacity of the people in the framing of laws, Monteſquieu propoſed repreſentatives, or men who ſhould make the laws for them. Jean Jaques would not allow theſe men to be repreſentatives in any thing but in name: He contended, that Monteſquieu, in cauſing deputies to be choſen, placed the people under at-

* Chap. 3, Book II. † Chap. 7, Book I.

tornies

tornies and barriſters, that is to ſay, under men who were to plead their cauſe as a guardian does that of his ward. But neither attornies nor guardians could be looked upon as real repreſentatives. That theſe men, whoſe judgment the people would be obliged to receive as law, might differ both in will and opinion from the people; in fine, it was giving abſolute legiſlators to the people, and thereby diveſting it of the legiſlative power. He further obſerves, that the will of the people could be no more repreſented by theſe deputies than that of a ward by his guardian. And he adds, in ſpite of his maſter, "*The Sovereign*, (the "people) *which is only a collective being, cannot be* "*repreſented but by itſelf; the power may be tranſ-* "*mitted, but not the will.* Beſides, the Sovereign "power may ſay, 'my will at preſent agrees with "the will of ſuch a man, or at leaſt with what he "declares to be his will;' but it cannot ſay, 'our "wills ſhall likewiſe agree to-morrow,' as it "would be abſurd to think of binding the will "for any time to come *."

V. The people above the laws.

From theſe reaſonings certain qualities and rights are inferred, which Monteſquieu would not perhaps have refuſed to the Sovereign people, but which he had not dared to expreſs. This Sovereign made the law; and, whatever might be

the law made by the people, *it could not be unjuſt*, as no perſon can be unjuſt towards himſelf.

The Sovereign people make the laws, but no law can bind them. "For, continues Jean Jaques, "in every caſe the people are maſters, to change "even the beſt laws: for, if that body is diſpoſed "to injure itſelf, who has a right to prevent "it *?"

VI. Aſſemblies of the people.

In ſhort the great difficulty which Monteſquieu found in free men being their own governors and legiſlators lay in the impoſſibility of holding, eſpecially in great ſtates, the aſſemblies of this legiſlative people. Theſe inconveniences, or even impoſſibilities, vaniſh before Jean Jaques, becauſe he felt that either the principle was to be abandoned, or the conſequences to be followed up; and neither Parliaments nor States General could ſuffice for him; he wiſhed for real aſſemblies of the whole people. "The Sovereign, having no "other force but the legiſlative power, acts only "by the laws; and the laws being only the au- "thentic acts of the general will, the *Sovereign* "*can never act but when the people are aſſembled.* "Some will perhaps think, that the idea of the "people aſſembling is a mere chimera: but, "if it be ſo now, it was not ſo two thouſand years "ago; and I ſhould be glad to know whether

* Chap. 12, Book II.

"men

" men have changed their nature? The limits " of poſſibility, in moral things, are not ſo con- " fined as many are apt to ſuppoſe them: it is " our weakneſs, our vice, and our prejudice, that " narrow the circle. The abject mind diſtruſts " the very idea of a great ſoul; and vile ſlaves " hearken with a ſneer of contempt when we talk " to them of Liberty *."

Examples of a ſovereign people falſe.

However confidently Jean Jaques may have laid down this doctrine, ſtill the examples which he adduces to corroborate it were far from demonſtrating that theſe aſſemblies of the Sovereign had ever exiſted. The citizens, for inſtance, of Rome or Athens were perpetually flocking to the forum; but thoſe citizens, eſpecially the people of Rome, were not the Sovereign people and every where Sovereign. The Empire was immenſe, and the people in this immenſe Empire, ſo far from being Sovereign, were a people enſlaved by a Deſpotic Metropolis, by an army *of four hundred thouſand ſoldiers* called Citizens, always ready to burſt forth from an entrenched camp called *Rome*, to cruſh any town or province which ſhould dare to aſſert its own liberties. Athens followed the ſame conduct with reſpect to its colonies and allied towns.

* Chap. 12, Book III.

Theſe

Theſe examples adduced by Jean Jaques only ſhowed what the French Revolution has, ſince, ſo well demonſtrated: that when the inhabitants of an immenſe town, like Rome or Paris, take up arms, they may ſtyle their Revolutions by the names of Liberty and Equality, but all the real diſtinction is, that in place of one King whom they may have baniſhed or murdered, the inhabitants are transformed into four or five hundred thouſand Deſpots and Tyrants over the Provinces, while they in their turn are tyrannized by their tribunes. Are not the aſhes of Lyons, are not the unfortunate people of Rouen or Bourdeaux the unhappy examples that may be cited to ſhow what fate awaited the miſerable town that might attempt to ſhake off the yoke of the ſuburbs of St. Marceau, St. Antoine, or of the citizens of Paris? And has not that immenſe town paid its tribute to a Robeſpierre at one time, and at another to the five Kings?

At ſome times, however, Jean Jaques was ſenſible of theſe inconveniences. But he would not on that account abandon his grand principle of the Sovereignty of the people, nor even the general aſſemblies. He would, after Monteſquieu's example, have recourſe *to the virtue* of Republics or of the Sovereign people; but he would even reproach Monteſquieu with a " frequent *want of* " *preciſion* in not making the neceſſary diſtinctions, " and

Jean Jaques reproaches Monteſquieu.

" and not perceiving, that, the Sovereign autho-
" rity being every where the ſame, the ſame prin-
" ciple muſt prevail in every well conſtituted
" ſtate." Then he would add, " that there is no
" government ſo ſubject to civil wars and internal
" agitations, as the democratic or popular one ;"
(that is to ſay, as the ſtate of which virtue is the
baſis) " becauſe there is not one which has ſo
" ſtrong and ſo continual a tendency to change its
" form, which can only be preſerved by the vi-
" gilance and courage employed to maintain
" it *."

He even then confeſſes, that " if there were a
" nation of Gods, *they* might be governed by a
" Democracy ; but ſo perfect a government will
" not agree with men †." Yet then, leſt, after Monteſquieu's example, he ſhould be wanting in preciſion, he proſcribes all great empires from the ſweets of liberty ; he would allow of none but ſmall ſtates ‡, of one town in each ſtate ; and capitals are in his plan particularly excluded §.

VII. Diviſion of ſtates.

His doctrine on this point is preciſe enough, when he ſays, " no city, any more than a nation,
" can be lawfully ſubjected to another, becauſe the
" eſſence of the body politic conſiſts in the per-
" fect union of obedience and liberty, and becauſe
" the words *Subject* and *Sovereign* are the identical

* Chap. 4, Book III. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.
§ Chap. 13, Book III.

" co-relatives

" co-relatives whoſe meaning is united in the word " *Citizen* *." That is to ſay in a plain ſtyle, that all the Sovereigns and Subjects of a given ſtate are only the burgeſſes of the ſame town. That a *Citizen*, ſubject and ſovereign of London, has no authority at Portſmouth or Plymouth, and the citizens, ſubjects and ſovereigns of theſe latter or any other towns cannot be ſubject to a ſovereign which inhabits another town. And Jean Jaques continues, " It is always wrong to unite many cities " in one (that is to ſay in one empire); it would " be abſurd to ſpeak of the abuſes prevalent in " great ſtates, to thoſe who would wiſh to form " only ſmall ones. But it is proper to conſider, " how ſufficient ſtrength can be communicated to " ſmall ſtates, to defend them from the attacks of " great ones? The reply here is, that they muſt " follow the footſteps of the Grecian cities, which " formerly reſiſted the power of the great King; " and of Holland and Switzerland who more re- " cently withſtood the houſe of Auſtria †." All which meant, that in this ſyſtem of Liberty and Equality applied to the ſovereign people it was neceſſary to ſubdivide the greater ſtates into ſmall federative democracies.

" In fine, if it be impoſſible to reduce a ſtate " within proper limits, (notwithſtanding his ad-

* Chap. 13, Book III. † Ibid.

" miration for Rome), there is ſtill one meaſure " to be adopted—that of not allowing a capital, " or ſettled ſeat of government, but moving it in " rotation to every city, and aſſembling the ſtates " of the country alternately in the ſame man- " ner *."

Leſt it ſhould be objected to our Philoſopher, that to form theſe little democracies, would only be ſubdividing the larger ſtates into ſo many leſſer provinces, which would be for ever a prey *to civil war and inteſtine diviſions*, and always *tending to change their form*, which he declares to be the lot of all democracies, he is pleaſed to grant exiſtence to ariſtocracies. Theſe, and particularly " the " Elective Ariſtocracy, which is the true one, are " the beſt of all governments †." But whether Democracy, Ariſtocracy, or Monarchy be adopted, the people always remain ſovereign; the general aſſemblies of the ſovereign are always requiſite, and they were to be frequent, " and ſo ordered as to aſſemble of courſe at the ſtated period, without " being formally convened, not leaving it in the " power of any Prince or Magiſtrate to prevent " the meeting *without openly declaring himſelf a* " *violator* of the laws, and an enemy to the " ſtate ‡."

* Chap. 13, Book III. † Chap. 5, Book III.
‡ Chap. 18, Book III.

Jean

Jean Jaques, more conſequent than his maſter, follows up the principle he had borrowed from Monteſquieu, and continues, "at the opening of "theſe aſſemblies, whoſe object is the mainte- "nance of the ſocial treaty, two queſtions ſhould "always be propoſed, and never on any account "omitted; and the ſuffrages ſhould be taken ſe- "parately on each—The firſt ſhould be, Does it "pleaſe the Sovereign (the people) to preſerve "the preſent form of government? And the "ſecond, Does it pleaſe the people to leave the "adminiſtration with thoſe who are at preſent "charged with it*?" That is to ſay, to continue the Magiſtrate, the Prince, or the King, whom they had choſen.

VIII. Queſtions to be made at the aſſemblies of the people.

Theſe two queſtions in the ſyſtem of the ſovereignty of the people are only conſequences of the great principle laid down by Monteſquieu, *that every man feeling himſelf a free agent ought to be his own governor*. For this man, or people, feeling themſelves free agents, might not chuſe to be governed to-day after the ſame manner they were governed yeſterday. If they were unwilling, how could they be free agents, when obliged to maintain that government and thoſe chiefs which they had formerly choſen.

Such a conſequence would have made any Philoſopher leſs intrepid than Jean Jaques abandon

the principle. Without pretending to Philoſophy, one might have told him, 'that every people which foreſaw the misfortunes that perpetual revolutions in their government expoſed them to, might without vilifying or enſlaving themſelves, have choſen a Conſtitution and ſworn to maintain it. They might have choſen Chiefs, Magiſtrates, or Kings, who were bound by oath to govern according to that Conſtitution: a compact which it would be no leſs criminal to violate, than the moſt ſacred oath (and equally ſo to-morrow as to-day). If the people are ſuppoſed to ſacrifice their Liberty by a compact of this nature, you will call every honeſt man by the degrading name of ſlave, who ſhall think himſelf bound by the promiſe he made yeſterday, or the oath he took to live according to the laws of the ſtate?' But ſuch reaſonings would have had little weight with Jean Jaques. In his opinion, it was a great error to pretend, that a Conſtitution equally binding for the people and their chiefs was a compact between the people and the chiefs they had choſen; becauſe (ſays he) "it would be abſurd and contradictory to ſuppoſe, that the Sovereign ſhould "give itſelf a ſuperior; and that, to oblige itſelf "to obey a maſter, would be to reinſtate itſelf in "the fullneſs of Liberty *."

* Chap. 16, Book III.

Such

Such was the conſequence naturally flowing from the idea of the ſovereignty of the people, of the people eſſentially ſovereign, who to be free muſt be their own governors, and who muſt retain, notwithſtanding all their oaths, the right of annulling to-day thoſe very laws, which yeſterday they ſwore to maintain. This concluſion, however ſtrange it may appear, is nevertheleſs that in the application of which the Revolutionary Sophiſter particularly exults when he ſays, "when it happens "therefore that the people eſtabliſh an heredi-"tary government, whether it be Monarchical in "family, or Ariſtocratical in one order of Citi-"zens, *it is not an engagement which they make*, but "a proviſional form given to Adminiſtration, until "it ſhall pleaſe the Sovereign to order otherwiſe *." That is to ſay, until it ſhall pleaſe the people to expel their Senate, Parliament, or King. IX. Kings only proviſional.

Let not the reader be aſtoniſhed at ſeeing me inſiſt ſo much in theſe memoirs on the expoſition of ſuch a ſyſtem. The application of the cauſes to the effects will be more evident when the Hiſtorian treats of the acts of the French Revolution. But ſhould he wiſh to know more particularly, how much our Philoſopher of Geneva influenced the warfare which the Revolution had kindled againſt every throne, let him examine how this

* Chap. 18, Book III.

Sophiſter applies his principles to Monarchies, and the leſſons that he teaches to all nations reſpecting their Kings.

X. Every Monarchy a real Democracy.

Here again it was Monteſquieu who had laid the ground-work, and Jean Jaques raiſed the ſuperſtructure. He, walking in the footſteps of his maſter, admits the abſolute neceſſity of ſeparating the Legiſlative from the Executive Power, but, always more daring than Monteſquieu, he ſcarcely leaves to Monarchy its very name. "I therefore "denominate every State a Republic which is re- "gulated by laws, under whatever form of admi- "niſtration it may be; for then only the public "intereſts governs, and the affairs of the public "obtain a due regard.—*To be legitimate*, the go- "vernment ſhould not be confounded with the "Sovereignty, but be conſidered as its admini- "ſtrator; and then Monarchy itſelf would be a "Republic *."

Theſe laſt words ſeem to imply, that Jean Jaques recognized at leaſt the legitimacy of a King who would receive the law from the people, and who, acquieſcing in their ſovereignty, would ſubmit to be a ſimple adminiſtrator, in a word their ſlave. For, according to this ſyſtem, the only free man is he who makes the laws, and the only ſlave he

* Chap. 6, and Note to Book II.

who

who receives them. The people were to make the law, the King to receive it; the King therefore is only the ſlave of the ſovereign people.

XI. To govern without Kings if poſſible.

On ſuch conditions Jean Jaques conſents to recognize a King in great empires; but he teaches the people at the ſame time, that it is owing to their own faults if a King be neceſſary in ſuch a ſtate. They would have learned to govern themſelves without one if they had reflected, that *the greater the enlargement of the ſtate, the more Liberty is diminiſhed* *; that their real intereſt would have been to occupy a ſpace of ground a hundred times leſs extenſive, in order to become a hundred times more free; that if it be difficult for a large ſtate to be properly governed, it is ſtill more ſo for it to be *well-governed by one man.*

XII. Kings mere Officers which the People may depoſe.

In fine, whatever ſtates theſe may be, we are never to forget, according to this Philoſopher, that the whole dignity of thoſe men called KINGS "*is certainly no more than a commiſſion*, under "which, ſimply as officers of the ſovereign power, "they exerciſe in the name of the Sovereign the "power delegated to them, and which may be "limited, modified, or recalled at the will of the "Sovereign †."

Even on theſe conditions, had Jean Jaques ſucceeded according to his wiſhes, Kings, though

* Chap. 1, Book III. † Ibid.

reduced to mere Officers or Commiſſioners for the Sovereign people, would not have had a long exiſtence. This wiſh is clearly expreſſed throughout the whole of his Chapter on Monarchy *. There he has heaped up every argument againſt Royalty, whether hereditary or elective; there, extolling the ſuppoſed virtues of the multitude, he beholds the throne invaded by Tyrants, or vicious, covetous and ambitious Deſpots. Nor did he fear to add, that if we were to underſtand by KING him who governs *only for the welfare of his ſubjects*, it would be evident that *there had never exiſted one from the commencement of the world* †.

The direct conſequences of this whole ſyſtem evidently were, that every nation deſirous of preſerving its rights of Liberty and Equality, was in the firſt place to endeavour to govern itſelf without a King, and to adopt a Republican Conſtitution; that nations who judged a King neceſſary, were cautiouſly to preſerve all the rights of Sovereignty, and never to loſe ſight, in quality of Sovereigns, of their inherent right of depoſing the King they had created, of ſhivering his ſcepter, and of overturning his throne, whenever, and as often as they pleaſed. Not one of theſe conſequences ſtartled the Philoſopher of Geneva. He was obliged to admit them, leſt it ſhould be ob-

* Chap. 6, Book III. † Note to Chap. 10, Book III.

jected

jected (as he had done againſt Monteſquieu) that *he ſometimes wanted preciſion!* and once more to leave the world a prey to ſlavery. Had it been objected, that it was preciſely among thoſe nations who carried their ideas of Liberty, Equality, and Sovereignty to the greateſt lengths, that the greateſt number of ſlaves were to be found, he would have contented himſelf with anſwering, "Such, it is true, was the ſituation of Sparta.— "But as to you, people of the preſent day, you "have no ſlaves, *but are yourſelves enſlaved.*— "You purchaſe their Liberty at the expence of "your own. Forbear then to exult in a prefer- "ence which diſcovers, in my opinion, more of "indolence than of humanity *."

XIII. All nations ſlaves at preſent.

It is evident that Rouſſeau, always more lively and more daring than his maſter, could not ſuppreſs any of the conſequences which flowed from the principle laid down by Monteſquieu. He brands every nation, even the Engliſh, with ſlavery, declaring them all to be ſlaves under their Kings.

His religion Deiſm.

To have ſurpaſſed his maſter in politics was not ſufficient. Monteſquieu is often lax, even inſinuates error, and, notwithſtanding all the eulogy he beſtows on Chriſtianity, appears ſometimes to ſacrifice the religious virtues to politics; yet he

* Chap. 15, Book III.

appeared

appeared too timid to his diſciples. Jean Jaques, more dogmatic, declares openly that he knows of no Religion *more deſtructive of the ſocial ſpirit* than that of the Goſpel; and he paints a true Chriſtian as a being always ready to bend his neck under the yoke of a Cromwell or a Catiline.

Monteſquieu had mentioned the *Catholic Religion* as particularly adapted to moderate Governments and Monarchy; *the Proteſtant Religion* as appropriate to Republics *. Jean Jaques will neither allow of the Catholic nor of the Proteſtant Chriſtian, and finiſhes his ſyſtem with Bayle's famous paradox that Monteſquieu had refuted. He conceived no Religion but Deiſm to be worthy a Sovereign, equal, and free people; and in order to undermine every throne, he baniſhes from the ſtate every altar where the God of Chriſtianity was adored †.

This concluſion alone raiſed Jean Jaques far above Monteſquieu in the eyes of the Sophiſters. Time was to decide which of theſe two ſyſtems ſhould bear away the palm of victory. Let the hiſtorian compare the effects of each, obſerving their nature and ſucceſſive progreſs of opinion. He will then be leſs ſurprized at beholding that ſchool triumph which is regardleſs of the ſanctity of the Altar and of the authority of the Throne.

* Spirit of Laws, Chap. 5, Book XXIV.

† See Social Contract, Chap. 8, Book IV.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Third Step of the Conſpiracy.

The general Effect of the Syſtems of Monteſquieu and Jean Jaques.

Convention of the Sophiſters—The Coalition of their Plots againſt the Throne, with their Plots againſt the Altar.

IN comparing the two Syſtems that we have juſt expoſed, it is eaſy to remark, that the reſpective authors of thoſe Syſtems have been biaſſed in their application of the ideas of Liberty and Equality to polity by the different ſtations which they held in life. The firſt, born of that claſs in ſociety that is diſtinguiſhed by riches and honours, participated leſs of thoſe ideas of Equality which confound every claſs of citizens. Notwithſtanding his great admiration for ancient Republics, he obſerves, that "In every ſtate there are always perſons "diſtinguiſhed by their birth, riches, or honours; "but were they to be confounded with the com- "mon people, and to have only the weight of a "ſingle vote like the reſt, the common liberty "would be their ſlavery, and they would have no "intereſt

Why Monteſquieu aims at Ariſtocracy.

" intereſt in ſupporting it, as moſt of the popular " reſolutions would be againſt them *."

It was this ſyſtem which was at an after-period to induce the Jacobin Club to ſtyle Monteſquieu the *Father of Ariſtocracy*; and it appears that he was led to the adoption of this idea by the ſuppoſition that the claſs of citizens (the parliament) to which he belonged, would become legiſlators; and thus, enjoying his diſtinctive mark of liberty, would be their own governors, and would never obey any but their own laws. The care he had taken not to generalize his ideas, excepting when treating of the iſland where he had learned to admire them, ſcreened him from all cenſure, and removed any imputation of his wiſhing to overturn the conſtitution of his country, in order to introduce that of another. But ſuch a precaution did not repreſs that deſire which he had kindled in the breaſts of many of his readers, a deſire of ſeeing that conſtitution, which he ſo much extolled, eſtabliſhed in their own country, a deſire alſo of the only laws congenial to liberty, thoſe of a country where each perſon is his own governor.

Why his ſyſtem is extolled, and by whom.

The French at that period, little accuſtomed to political diſcuſſions, rather enjoyed the advantages of their government under the laws of their Mo-

* Spirit of Laws, Chap. 6, Book XI.

narch,

narch, than cavilled at his authority. They were free under their laws, nor did they loſe their time in diſquiſitions on the poſſibility of being ſo, though they had not participated in the making of them. The novelty of the ſubject irritated the curioſity of a nation with whom the bare title of *Spirit of Laws* was ſufficient to captivate their ſuffrages. Beſides, it contained an immenſe fund of learning; and in ſpite of many witty reflections, even bordering on epigram, a ſtrong feature of moderation and candour laid further claim to the public eſteem. The Engliſh alſo admired it. Notwithſtanding Monteſquieu's reſerves, it was but natural for them to extol ſo great a genius, whoſe chief error lay in having believed that their laws and their conſtitution were ſufficient to impart liberty to all nations, whatever might be their moral or political poſition on the globe.

The eſteem in which a nation, perhaps at that time its moſt worthy rival, had always held Great Britain, added much to the high repute of the Spirit of Laws. It was tranſlated into ſeveral languages; and it would have been a diſgrace for a Frenchman not to have been acquainted with it. I hope the expreſſion I am going to make uſe of will be forgiven; that poiſon, that true ſource of the moſt democratic of all revolutions, infuſed itſelf without being perceived. The ground-work is entirely comprized in the principle, that *Every man*

man who is ſuppoſed a free agent ought to be his own governor, which is abſolutely ſynonimous with another, viz. "*it is in the body of the people that the* "*legiſlative power reſides.*" Thoſe members of the ariſtocracy who admired Monteſquieu, had not ſufficiently weighed the conſequences of this grand axiom. They did not perceive that the Sophiſters of rebellion would one day only change the terms, when they proclaimed that the *law* was but the *expreſſion of the general will*, and hence conclude, that it is a right inherent in the people or multitude to enact or abrogate all laws; and that ſhould the people change and overturn every thing at pleaſure, they would do no more than exerciſe a right.

He forwards Democracy.

When Monteſquieu paſſed over theſe conſequences, or rather pretended not to ſee them; when, viewing the different Monarchies of Europe, he finds himſelf obliged to confeſs that he knew of no people, one excepted, who exerciſed the pretended right of governing themſelves, and of making their own laws; when he adds, that the leſs they exerciſed that right, the more *the Monarchy degenerated towards Deſpotiſm*; when, declaring that Liberty was at an end wherever thoſe powers which were generally concentrated in the perſon of the Sovereign, were not diſtinct, he ſeems to conſole nations, by flattering them with a greater or ſmaller portion of Liberty, for which they

they were indebted to what he calls prejudices, to their love *of the Subject's, the State's, and the Prince's glory* * ; in what cloud could he have enveloped himſelf? After having laid down principles which ſtigmatize all nations as in a ſtate of ſlavery, will he pretend to appeaſe their minds by ſpeaking of what little Liberty prejudice may have left them? Are not theſe ſome of the *voluntary obſcurities* which D'Alembert ſtyles *innocent artifices?* Or, are we to join with Jean Jaques in accuſing Monteſquieu *of not being preciſe, and being often obſcure?*

Be this as it may, ſuch were Monteſquieu's principles, that it was impoſſible to adopt them either in France or elſewhere, without inviting thoſe aweful revolutions which, ſnatching the moſt important branch of the Royal prerogative from the Monarch, inveſt the people with his ſpoils. After the *Spirit of Laws* only one thing was wanting to operate ſuch a Revolution; and that was, a man who, ſufficiently daring, would aſſert theſe conſequences without fear, perhaps even complacently, becauſe he beheld in them a means of annihilating all titles or diſtinctions, which decorate ſtations of life ſuperior to his own. The ſon of a poor artizan, in a word Jean Jaques Rouſſeau, bred in a watchmaker's ſhop, proved to be this daring man. He graſped the weapons which

* Chap. 7, Book XI.

Mon-

Monteſquieu had forged to aſſert the privileges of the multitude, and aſcertain the rights of legiſlation and ſovereignty in the poor workman as the former had in the rich man; in the commoner as in the nobleman. The whole ariſtocracy of Monteſquieu was no more than a ſcaffolding for the Sophiſters of rebellion; and if he ever uſes the word *Ariſtocracy* as expreſſing the beſt government, it was only in its original ſignification; he does not underſtand by it the government of the wealthy and noble claſſes, but that of the *beſt* of each, whether rich or poor, who were to be choſen magiſtrates by the people; and then in the very ariſtocracy he conſtitutes the people Legiſlators and Sovereigns.

Monteſquieu believed the Nobility to be neceſſary intermediates between the King and the People. Jean Jaques deteſted theſe intermediate bodies, and thought it abſurd that a ſovereign people ſhould ſtand in need of them. Monteſquieu parcels out the authority of Kings, to adorn the ariſtocracy of riches and nobility with one of its faireſt branches. Jean Jaques, pennyleſs, ſhivers the ſcepter of his King, and proſcribes the prerogative of nobility or wealth, and to aſſimilate himſelf to the Peer or Nobleman he inveſts the Sovereignty in the multitude. Both foreboded Revolutions; both taught nations that they laboured under the yoke of ſlavery, whatever may have been

Compariſon and natural effects of the two ſyſtems.

been their proteſtations to the contrary; both led nations to believe, that the liberty of the ſubject could never be aſcertained until they had adopted new Conſtitutions and new Laws, and had choſen chiefs, who, more dependent on the people, would enſure the liberty of the ſubject at the expence of their own.

Both, in giving their ideas upon Liberty, inſtructed nations in what they ought to do to acquire this ſuppoſed Liberty. Public opinion, like the two ſyſtems, was to be reſtrained within certain limits with Monteſquieu, or expand itſelf to any lengths with Jean Jaques, according to the ſtrength, preponderance or multitude of diſciples which intereſt might have enrolled under the banners of either of theſe modern politicians. Every reflecting perſon could already foreſee, that all the rebels of Ariſtocracy would follow Monteſquieu as their chief, but that all the lower claſſes, and all the enemies of Ariſtocracy, whether from hatred or jealouſy, would fight under Jean Jaques.

Such muſt have been the natural effect of theſe two ſyſtems according to the progreſs they made in the public opinion. This effect, it is true, might have been counteracted by opinions ſtill predominant among many nations, whom theſe falſe ideas of Liberty had not miſled ſo far, as to make them believe they lived in ſlavery, becauſe they were governed by the laws of their Princes.

All theſe revolutionary principles muſt have been fruitleſs in nations whoſe religious tenets teach and ordain ſubmiſſion to their lawful Sovereign, in nations where the Goſpel was followed and reſpected, a Goſpel which equally proſcribes injuſtice, arbitrary and tyrannic power in the Prince, and rebellion in the Subject, which, teaching the true worſhip of the King of Kings, does not inſtil pride into nations by ſtunning them with the repeated proclamation of their ſovereignty.

But the Sophiſters of Impiety had undermined the foundations of the Religion of the Goſpel, and numerous were their impious adepts. Many had been led to impiety by their ambition, and by the jealouſy they had conceived againſt thoſe who enjoyed diſtinctions or exerciſed power, and they ſoon perceived that by means of theſe two ſyſtems, the ſame ideas of Liberty and Equality, which had proved ſuch powerful agents againſt Chriſtianity, might prevail alſo againſt all political Governments.

The Sophiſters conſpire, and adopt the ſyſtem againſt Kings.

Till this period, the hatred which the ſchool of Voltaire, or the brethren of D'Alembert, had conceived againſt Kings was vague and without any plan. In general, it was a mere thirſt after Liberty and Equality, or a hatred of all coercive authority. But the neceſſity of a civil government ſtifled all their cries. Here they were convinced, that to deſtroy was not ſufficient, and that

in

in overturning the preſent laws, it was neceſſary to have another code to replace the former.— Their writings teemed with epigrams againſt Kings, but they had not attacked their rights; Deſpotiſm and Tyranny were repreſented in the moſt ſarcaſtic light, though they had not yet declared that every Prince was a Deſpot or a Tyrant. But this was no longer the caſe when theſe two ſyſtems had appeared; Monteſquieu taught them to govern themſelves, and make their laws in conjunction with their Kings; and Jean Jaques perſuades them to expell all Kings, and to govern and make their laws themſelves. The Sophiſters no longer heſitate, and the overthrow of every throne is reſolved on, as they had before reſolved on the deſtruction of every altar. From that period the two conſpiracies are combined and form but one in the ſchool of the Sophiſters. It is no longer the iſolated voice of a Voltaire, or of any particular adept who, following the exploſions of his brain, raiſes a ſarcaſtic cry againſt the authority of Kings; it is the combined efforts of the Sophiſters leagued in plots of rebellion and impiety, aiming all their hatred, their means, their wiſhes and their artifices, at teaching all nations to deſtroy the throne of their Kings, as they had formerly excited them to overturn the altars of their God.

Such an accuſation is important, it is direct; and the proofs are taken from the words of the conſpirators themſelves. It is not only the ſimple avowal of the conſpiracy, but the exulting pride of the Sophiſter who glories in his crime. He paints the hypocriſy, the wickedneſs, the hideouſneſs of his crime in as glowing colours as if he had delineated the triumph of genius and wiſdom, in a word of true Philoſophy, in the cauſe of the happineſs of mankind. Let us attend, and we ſhall hear them tracing the hiſtory of their plots, which they repreſent as the climax of human underſtanding in Philoſophical learning.

Proofs of the conſpiracy.

The French Revolution had hurled the unfortunate Lewis XVI. from his throne, when the moſt unrelenting conſpirator, that monſter Condorcet, thinks it incumbent on him to celebrate the glory of Philoſophiſm, and trace the progreſs of this fiend which had kindled the torch of diſcord and had reared the Republic on crime, bloodſhed, and the ruins of the throne. Leſt the ſchool whence theſe horrid deeds had iſſued, ſhould not be known, he deſcribes it from its origin, and hiſtorifies all the monſters of iniquity and rebellion which each century had produced. He then deſcends to the new Republican æra. That hiſtory may carefully weigh his evidence and appreciate his avowal, his words ſhall ſuffer no alteration: without interruption from us he may extol his

ſchool

ſchool and its pretended beneſactions. He ſuppoſes us at the middle of this century, conſiders his reader as arrived at that period when the delirium of ſuperſtition is diſpelled by the firſt rays of modern Philoſophy. Then it is that he developes the following plot as the hiſtory and triumph of his falſe Philoſophy.

Avowal of Condorcet.

" *There was a claſs of men which ſoon formed* " *itſelf in Europe* with a view not ſo much to " diſcover and make deep reſearch after truth as " to diffuſe it: whoſe chief object was to attack " prejudices in the very aſylums where the Clergy, " the Schools, the Governments, and the ancient " Corporations had received and protected them; " and made their glory to conſiſt rather in de- " ſtroying popular error than in extending the " limits of ſcience: this, though an indirect " method of forwarding its progreſs, was not on " that account either leſs dangerous or leſs uſe- " ful.

" In England Collins and Bolingbroke, in " France Bayle, Fontenelle, Voltaire, Monteſ- " quieu, and *the ſchools formed by theſe men*, com- " bated in favour of truth. They alternately em- " ployed all the arms with which learning and " Philoſophy, with which wit and the talent of " writing could furniſh reaſon. *Aſſuming every* " *tone, taking every ſhape*, from the ludicrous to " the pathetic, from the moſt learned and exten-

" ſive compilation to the Novel or the petty
" Pamphlet of the day, covering truth with a
" veil, which, *ſparing the eye that was too weak,*
" incited the reader *by the pleaſure of ſurmiſing*
" *it,* inſidiouſly careſſing prejudice in order to
" ſtrike it with more certainty and effect; ſeldom
" menacing more than one at a time, and that
" only in part; ſometimes flattering the enemies
" of reaſon *by ſeeming to aſk but for a half tolera-*
" *tion in Religion or a half Liberty in polity; re-*
" *ſpecting Deſpotiſm when they impugned religious*
" *abſurdities, and Religion when they attacked ty-*
" *ranny; combating theſe two peſts in their very*
" *principles, though apparently inveighing againſt*
" *ridiculous and diſguſting abuſes; ſtriking at the*
" *root of thoſe peſtiferous trees, whilſt they appeared*
" *only to wiſh to lop the ſtraggling branches; at one*
" *time marking out ſuperſtition, which covers deſpo-*
" *tiſm with its impenetrable ſhield, to the friends of*
" *Liberty, as the firſt victim which they are to im-*
" *molate, the firſt link to be cleft aſunder; at another*
" *denouncing it to Deſpots as the real enemy of their*
" *power,* and frightening them with its hypocriti-
" cal plots and ſanguinary rage; but indefatigable
" when they claimed *the independence of Reaſon and*
" *the Liberty of the Preſs* as the right and ſafeguard
" of mankind; inveighing with enthuſiaſtic energy
" againſt the crimes of Fanaticiſm and Tyranny;
" reprobating every thing which bore the character

" of

" of oppreſſion, harſhneſs, or barbarity, whe-
" ther in Religion, Adminiſtration, Morals or
" Laws; commanding Kings, Warriors, Prieſts
" and Magiſtrates in the name of nature to ſpare
" the blood of men; reproaching them in the
" moſt energetic ſtrain with that which their
" policy or indifference prodigally laviſhed on
" the ſcaffold or in the field of battle; in fine,
" adopting *reaſon, toleration, and humanity* as their
" ſignal and watch-word.

" Such was the Modern Philoſophy, ſo much
" deteſted by thoſe numerous claſſes whoſe very
" exiſtence were drawn from prejudices—Its chiefs
" had the art of eſcaping vengeance, though ex-
" poſed to hatred; *of hiding themſelves from perſe-*
" *cution, though ſufficiently conſpicuous to loſe nothing*
" *of their glory* *."

Had rebellion, impiety, and revolt wiſhed to trace their means and aſcertain their object, could they have made a better choice than the pen of Condorcet to delineate the actors, deſcribe their deteſtable plots, and fix the epoch of their double conſpiracy, which, firſt aiming at the altar, is afterward directed and purſued with fury againſt all Kings and Rulers of nations. How could their means and plots have been rendered more manifeſt? How could the hero of the plot, or the

Reſult of this avowal.

* Eſquiſſe d'un tableau hiſtorique de l'eſprit humain, 9 Epoque.

adept moſt intimately initiated in the myſteries of the conſpiracy, have more evidently pointed out the object, the double tendency of the Sophiſticated ſchool; or ſhown in a clearer light the wiſh of deſtroying the throne ſpringing from the league which they had formed againſt the altar?

Let the hiſtorian ſeize on this avowal or rather on this eulogy of plots. He will find concentrated and flowing from Condorcet's pen, every thing that the moſt daring and the deepeſt initiated conſpirator could have let fall, to characterize the moſt authenticated and moſt univerſal conſpiracy, planned by thoſe men called Philoſophers, not only attacking the perſons of particular Kings but of every King, and not Kings only, but the very eſſence of Royalty and all Monarchy. The commencement of this conſpiracy was when Collins, Bolingbroke, Bayle, and other maſters of Voltaire, together with that Sophiſter himſelf, had propagated their impious doctrines againſt the God of Chriſtianity.

We ſee it faſt riſing into eminence when Monteſquieu and Jean Jaques, nearly his contemporary, applying their ideas of Liberty and Equality to Polity, had given birth to that diſquiet ſpirit which ſought to inveſtigate the rights of Sovereigns, the extent of their authority, the pretended rights of the free man, and without which every ſubject is branded for a ſlave—and every King ſtyled

ſtyled a Deſpot. In fine, it is that period when their ſyſtems, by means of empty theories, furniſh the Sophiſters with a means of ſupplying the want of Kings in the government of nations.

Until that period the ſect ſeemed to have carried their views no further, than to the eſtabliſhment of Philoſophic Kings, or Kings at leaſt who would let themſelves be governed by Philoſophers; but, deſpairing of ſucceſs, they league in the oath of deſtroying all Royalty, the very inſtant they ſhall have found in any ſyſtem the means of governing without Kings.

The perſons who compoſe this ſchool of conſpirators are ſtrongly marked. They are the authors and adepts of this *Modern Philoſophy*, who, before they reſolved on the deſtruction of Monarchy, began by raiſing their heads againſt Religion; who, before they depicted every Government in the colours of Deſpotiſm and Tyranny, repreſent fanaticiſm and ſuperſtition as the ſole growth of Chriſtianity.

The extent, the means, the conſtancy of the conſpiracy all are ſhown in the cleareſt light.—Our conſpiring Sophiſters pretend to *aſk but for a half-toleration in Religion or a half-liberty in Polity*; *reſpecting* authority of Kings *when they impugned Religion, and Religion when they attacked* Royalty. They pretend *to inveigh only againſt abuſes*; but both Religion and the authority of Monarchs *are*

but

but two peſtiferous trees, at whoſe very *roots they ſtrike.* They are the two giants whom they combat in their principles, that every veſtige of their exiſtence might be annihilated.

They aſſume every tone, they take every ſhape, and artfully flatter thoſe whoſe power they wiſh to deſtroy. They ſpare no pains to deceive the Monarch whoſe throne they undermine. They *denounce* Religion *as the real enemy of their power*, and never ceaſe reminding their adepts, that it is Religion which covers Kings with an *impenetrable ſhield: That it is* the *firſt victim to be immolated, the firſt link to be cleft aſunder*, in order to ſucceed in ſhaking off the yoke of Kings, and in annihilating Monarchy, when once they ſhould have ſucceeded in cruſhing the God of that Religion.

The whole of this wicked game is combined among the adepts; their action, their union cannot be better delineated. Their watch-word is *Independence and Liberty.* They all have their ſecret, and during the moſt vigorous proſecution of their plots *they ſedulouſly conceal them. They nevertheleſs covertly purſue them with an indefatigable conſtancy.* What can be called conſpiracy, if this is not conſpiring againſt all Kings; and how could the Philoſophers more clearly demonſtrate, that the war which they waged againſt Chriſt and his Altar, againſt Kings and their Thrones, was a war of extermination?

I ſtill

I ſtill fear its being objected, that the Philoſophers did not mean to point at Royalty by the words *Deſpotiſm and Tyranny*. I have already ſaid, that the Deſpots and Tyrants whom the Sophiſters were to deſtroy could be no other than thoſe Monarchs under and againſt whom they did conſpire; and if the unfortunate Lewis XVI. was a Tyrant and a Deſpot in their eyes, the mildeſt and the moſt moderate of Monarchs muſt have been guilty of Tyranny and Deſpotiſm. But let it not be thought that theſe conſpiring Sophiſters were always reſtrained by a ſenſe of ſhame from caſting aſide the veil of Deſpotiſm and Tyranny with which they had ſhrowded the hatred they had conceived againſt Royalty. The ſame Condorcet who may be ſuppoſed (at the head of the Sophiſticated bands) to have attacked only Tyranny and Deſpotiſm, leaves us no room to doubt.

Scarcely had the original rebels called Conſtitutionaliſts left the name or phantom of a Monarch to France in the unfortunate Lewis XVI. ſo greatly had they abridged the regal authority; and moſt unjuſtly could that unfortunate Prince, in his degraded ſtate at leaſt, be accuſed of Deſpotiſm or Tyranny; nevertheleſs the deſigns of the Sophiſters had not been fulfilled, and it is Condorcet who undertakes to ſhew the extent of their views. Royalty was ſtill preſerved as to the name; and Condorcet now no longer exclaimed,

" Deſtroy

" Deſtroy the *Tyrant*, the *Deſpot*," but " *deſtroy* " *the* KING." Speaking in the name of the Philoſophic ſect, he propoſes his problems on Royalty in the moſt direct language. He entitled them *Of the Republic*; and the firſt queſtion he propoſes is, *Whether a King is neceſſary for Liberty?* He anſwers it himſelf, and declares that Royalty is not only unneceſſary and uſeleſs *but even contrary to Liberty*, that it is irreconcileable with Liberty; and after having ſolved this problem, he continues: " As to the reaſonings which may be " brought againſt us, we will not do them the " honour of refuting them; much leſs ſhall we " trouble ourſelves to anſwer that ſwarm of mer- " cenary writers, who have ſuch good reaſons for " believing that a Government cannot exiſt with- " out a civil liſt, and we will give them full liberty " to treat thoſe perſons as madmen who have the " misfortune to think as the ſages of every age " and nation have done before them *."

It is thus that, from the mouth of that Sophiſter, who was the moſt deeply initiated of the adepts, we learn, without the leaſt ſubterfuge, the extent of their plots; ſuch were the wiſhes of his pretended ſages. It is not only Deſpotiſm but Royalty itſelf, it is even the empty name of an impriſoned King, that is incompatible with Li-

* Of the Republic, by Condorcet, an. 1791.

berty.

berty. What then is neceſſary to accompliſh their laſt views with reſpect to Kings as well as to the Prieſthood? Theſe views are not confined to France alone, no, not even to Europe; but they extend to all nations, to the whole globe, to every region on which the ſun ſhines. It is no longer a wiſh it is a hope, it is the confidence of ſucceſs, which makes the ſame Sophiſter, adopting the prophetic ſtrain, announce to Kings and the Prieſthood, that, thanks to the union, toils, and unrelenting warfare of the Philoſophers, "the "day will come when the ſun ſhall ſhine on none "but free men, a day, when man, recognizing "no other maſter than his reaſon, when Tyrants "and their Slaves, when Prieſts, together with "their ſtupid and hypocritical agents, will have "no further exiſtence but in hiſtory or on the "ſtage *." At length the whole extent of their plots is revealed, and revealed by that adept who was at the head of the Sophiſticated ſchool; by him, whom the original maſters had judged to be the moſt proper perſon to ſucceed them and as moſt ſtrongly fired with their ſpirit; by him, in fine, who proves to be their *greateſt conſolation* in their laſt moments, as they leave a chief to their ſchool worthy of themſelves †. That their con-

* Of the Republic, by Condorcet, epoch 10.

† Voltaire to D'Alembert, let. 101, an. 1773.

ſpiracy

ſpiracy might be compleat, the *Royal Authority and the Prieſthood* were not to exiſt but in hiſtory or on the ſtage. In the former, as the ſubject of calumny and all the imprecations of the ſect; on the latter, as an object of public deriſion.

Evidence of many other adepts.

Condorcet is not, however, the only one of the Sophiſters, who, exulting in the ſucceſs of their double conſpiracy, lay open its ſource and ſhew it ſpringing from that concert and underſtanding of the Sophiſters, uniting their means, their labours, and directing them at one time againſt the throne, at another againſt the altar, with a common wiſh of cruſhing both the one and the other. Condorcet is, without doubt, the Sophiſter who betrays the greateſt vanity on the ſubject, becauſe he is the adept who, ſcoffing at all ſhame and diſclaiming every moral ſentiment, would bluſh the leaſt in deſcribing thoſe artifices which he ſo complacently relates; for it was he that could with the leaſt embarraſſment reconcile that atrocious diſſimulation, thoſe tortuous plans, thoſe ſnares laid at once for Prieſts, Kings, and Nations, to the rules of honour, probity, and truth; while the whole conduct of his ſchool exhibits a concatenation of guilt and cunning, unworthy of the Philoſopher, and becoming the odious conſpirator only. Many other adepts ſpeak their true ſentiments, when they declare their belief that the publication of their proceedings

ings can be no bar to the ſucceſs of the conſpiracy.

The Editors of the *Mercure*, La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort, had nearly been as explicit as Condorcet, when they publiſhed the following ſentence, " It is the arm of the people " that executes Revolutions, but it is the medi- " tations of the ſage that prepare them." Theſe adepts, like Condorcet, repreſent our pretended ſages as directing by ſilent and tortuous means, the minds of the people toward that Revolution which was to ſhiver the ſcepter of Lewis XVI. and whoſe grand object was to *break* the pretended *yoke of the Prieſthood* in order *to break that* of the pretended *Tyrants*, of Tyrants ſuch as Lewis XVI. the moſt humane and juſt of Kings, and whoſe fondeſt purſuit was the happineſs of his ſubjects. Before Condorcet and our Sophiſters of the *Mercure* many other adepts had ſhewn this concert and union, and had claimed the honour of this Revolution menacing every throne, as the glorious atchievements of their ſchool. Let us hearken to a man illuſtrious in the annals of Philoſophiſm, and whom as ſuch we may ſuppoſe well informed as to their plots.

La Harpe and Marmontel.

Mr. de la Metherie is not one of the common claſs of adepts; on the contrary, he was one of thoſe who had the art of inſinuating Atheiſm with all the ſeduction of natural ſcience. So early as on the

La Metherie.

the 1ſt of January 1790, this adept, who was deſervedly looked upon as one of the moſt learned of the ſect, begins his obſervations and memoirs with theſe remarkable words: "At length the "happy day is come when Philoſophy triumphs "over all its enemies. They are obliged to own, "that it is the light which Philoſophy has "ſpread, more eſpecially of late years, that has "produced *the great events which will diſtinguiſh* "*the end of this century.*" What are theſe great events which the learned Atheiſt claims in the name of Philoſophy? They are thoſe of a Revolution which diſcovers man *breaking the ſhackles of ſlavery*, and ſhaking off the yoke with which *audacious Deſpots* had burthened them. It is the people recovering their *inalienable right*, of making alone the laws, of depoſing Princes, of changing or continuing them according to their will and pleaſure, and of viewing their Sovereigns in no other light than as men who cannot infringe theſe popular laws *without being guilty of treaſon to the people.* Leſt the principles on which theſe pretended rights were founded ſhould be forgotten, he repeats them with enthuſiaſtic eloquence; leſt the glory of ſuch leſſons and their conſequences ſhould be attributed to any but the maſters of his ſchool; leſt, in ſhort, the intention and concert of its authors ſhould not be ſufficiently evident, he tells us, and that at the very moment when the unfortunate

Lewis

Lewis XVI. is the ſport of that legiſlative and ſovereign populace, "It is theſe truths repeated "thouſands and thouſands of times by the Philo- "ſophers of humanity, that have operated thoſe "precious effects, ſo long expected;" he carefully adds, that if France is the firſt to burſt the fetters of Deſpotiſm, it is becauſe the Philoſophers had prepared them for ſuch noble efforts *by a multitude of excellent writings*. And that we might be acquainted to what extent theſe ſucceſſes prepared by Philoſophy are to be carried by the concert of theſe leſſons repeated *thouſands and thouſands of times*, the adept La Metherie continues, "The "ſame lights are propagating throughout other "nations, and ſoon they will cry out like the "French, *we are determined to be free*—Let the "brilliant ſucceſs *which Philoſophy has juſt gained* "be a new ſpur to their courage—*Let us be per-* "*ſuaded that our labours will not be fruitleſs.*"

The foundation of this hope (and never let the hiſtorian loſe ſight of this obſervation, ſince the Philoſophers inceſſantly repeat it) reſts on the proſpect of an approaching Revolution in religious matters. It is becauſe ſects equally inimical to Royalty and Chriſtianity are daily increaſing in numbers and ſtrength, particularly in *North America* and in *Germany*. It is becauſe the new tenets *are ſilently propagated*, and that all theſe ſects unite their efforts with thoſe of Philoſophiſm.

He delineates the extent of their hopes, by declaring that Philoſophy, after having conquered Liberty in America and France, will carry its conqueſts on the one ſide into Poland, on the other into Spain and Italy, and even into Turkey; nay, more, that it will penetrate into the moſt diſtant regions; and that Egypt, Syria, and India itſelf, ſhall be tributary to it *.

Were it neceſſary to ſeek further proof that this Revolution had been the work of the combined efforts, of the wiſhes and labors of our modern Sophiſters, La Metherie will tell us, that he had clearly announced it to all Sovereigns when he ſaid, "Princes, do not deceive yourſelves—TELL "*raiſes the ſtandard of Liberty, and he is followed* "*by his fellow citizens.* The whole power of "Philip II. could not prevail againſt Holland; "and a cheſt of tea liberates America from the "yoke of the Engliſh. In all energetic nations "Liberty raiſes itſelf on the ruins of Deſpotiſm; "but Joſeph II. and Lewis XVI. were far from "thinking this warning regarded them. May "Kings, Ariſtocrats, and Theocrats profit by this "example!" Should they continue deaf to his voice, the ſame ſage will ſhrug his ſhoulders, and, pitying, ſay, "Theſe privileged perſons are bad "calculators of the courſe of the human mind

* Obſervations on Experimental Philoſophy and Natural Hiſtory, January 1790. Preliminary Diſcourſe.

"and

" and of the influence of Philoſophy; and let " them remember that their fall in France was " accelerated by the neglect of ſuch calcula- " tions *."

Another Philoſopher not leſs vain than La Metherie, extolling and revealing the plans, intentions and plots of the ſect, with nearly as much perſpicuity as Condorcet, is alſo acknowledged by it for one of its profoundeſt adepts. This is Gudin, who, adding his reveries to thoſe of Jean Jaques, makes the glory of his maſters conſiſt not only in the principles and the wiſh of the revolution, but in all they had done to bring it about, and which enabled them *to announce it as infallible.* Gudin.

This adept Gudin goes much further; for he tells us, that it was not the intention of the Philoſophers to operate this Revolution by the arm of the people, but by means of the King and his Miniſters; that they had forewarned them that it was in vain for them to pretend to ſtop it. According to him, " theſe ſame Philoſophers who, under " the ancient order of things, had told the King, " his Council, and his Miniſters, *that theſe changes* " *would take place in ſpite of them, if they would not* " *adopt them,* ſay at this preſent day to thoſe who " oppoſe the conſtitution, that it would be im- " poſſible to return to the old form of govern-

* *Idem,* January 1791, page 150.

" ment, whichever might be the party that car-
" ried the day, it being too imperfect and too
" much diſcredited even by the enemies of the
" new conſtitution *."

Theſe men therefore, whom we ſee to-day, under the name of Philoſophers, ſo numerous and ſuch zealous partizans of that Revolution which dethrones Kings; which inveſts the Sovereignty in the hands of the people, and executes ſyſtems the moſt directly oppoſite to the authority of Monarchs; theſe men, before they attempted to accompliſh their plans by the arm of the people, had already revolutionized the public opinion to that degree, and were ſo certain of their ſucceſs, that they boldly threatened both Kings and their Miniſters, if they would not adopt their Revolutionary ideas, with the completion of that long wiſhed for Revolution, in ſpite of all oppoſition.

It would be endleſs to quote the multitude of proofs which atteſt, that Philoſophiſm only waited for the ſucceſs of its plots, to glory in having contrived them. The hiſtorian will find thoſe proofs in the numerous diſcourſes pronounced by the adepts, either at the legiſlative club called National Aſſembly, or at the regulating club called the Jacobins; ſcarcely will he hear the name of Philoſophers pronounced in theſe revolutionary

* Supplement to the Social Contract, Chap. 2, Part III.

dens,

dens, without the grateful acknowledgment of their being the authors of the Revolution.

I could adduce proofs of a different nature. The adepts, for example, who many years before the Revolution entruſted with their ſecret thoſe whom they wiſhed to gain over to their party. I could name that Counſellor, that Sophiſter Bergier, whom Voltaire mentions as the moſt zealous adept *. I am acquainted with the perſon to whom this ſecret was entruſted five years before the Revolution, in the Park of St. Cloud, to whom Bergier without the leaſt heſitation ſaid, that the time was not diſtant when Philoſophy would triumph over Kings and the Prieſthood. That as to Kings, their Empire was at an end, and that the downfall of the grandees and nobility was equally certain. That the plans had been too well laid, and things were too far advanced, to leave room for any doubt of ſucceſs. But the man who has ſince entruſted me with theſe ſecrets, though he gave them to me in writing, will not conſent to have his name mentioned. He, like many others, at that time believed the dogmatic aſſertions of the Sophiſter, whom he knew to be one of the moſt profligate of the ſect, to be thoſe of folly. And at preſent like many others, not conceiving how much it imports, to hiſtory that facts of this kind

Bergier.

ſhould be authenticated by witneſſes of known veracity, he ſacrifices that grand object to the delicacy of not betraying what appears to have been but a confidential communication.

Alfonſe Le Roi.

Bound by ſuch ſcrupuloſities, I am obliged to paſs over many ſuch anecdotes, that would ſhow the Sophiſters entruſting the ſecrets of their plots, and foretelling as clearly as Bergier did, the downfall of Kings and the triumph of Philoſophy. I will conſent even to ſuppreſs the name of a French nobleman who, reſident in Normandy, received the following letter: "Monſieur Le Comte, do "not deceive yourſelf. This is not a ſudden "ſtorm. The Revolution is made and conſum-"mated. It has been preparing for theſe laſt "fifty years, and that by ſome of the greateſt "geniuſes in Europe. It has its abettors *in every* "*cabinet*. There will be no other Ariſtocracy "but that of wit, and you certainly will have a "greater claim to that than any body elſe." This letter was written, a few days after the taking of the Baſtile, by Alfonſe le Roi, a phyſician. It needs no comment.

Teſtimony of the repenting Le Roi.

It is now time to call my reader's attention to that other Le Roi whom we have mentioned in the firſt part of our Memoirs. He is not the vain Sophiſter glorying in his plots, not a Condorcet, a La Metherie, a Gudin, or an Alfonſe, who exultingly behold the triumph of Philoſophy in the crimes

crimes perpetrated and in the plots framed againſt the Altar and the Throne, No, this is the ſhame-faced and repenting adept, whom ſorrow and remorſe oblige to reveal a ſecret burſting from him in the agony of grief. But both the repentant and the proud adept perfectly agree in their evidence. For it would be a ſtrange error to believe, that the declaration of Le Roi and the object of his remorſe were confined to the Antichriſtian Conſpiracy. At the period when he made his declaration neither the conſtitution nor the oath of apoſtacy had been decreed. It had not as yet been propoſed to plunder and profane the temples, and to aboliſh the public worſhip. No blow had been given to the ſymbol of Chriſtianity. All was prepared and daily ſtarting into exiſtence; but as yet the aſſembly had only treſpaſſed againſt the political authority and the rights of their Sovereign. It was at the ſight of theſe firſt crimes that Le Roi is reproached with the miſerable effects of his ſchool, and it was to this reproach he anſwered, *To whom do you ſay ſo? I know it but too well, and I ſhall die of grief and remorſe.* When he diſcloſed all the heinouſneſs of the plot framed by his ſecret academy at the Hotel d'Holbach, when he declares that it was there that the Conſpiracy, whoſe dire effects they then beheld, had been formed and carried on; the plots which he deteſts are thoſe that he ſees attacking the Throne. If he declares

thoſe at the ſame time which had been formed againſt the altar, it is becauſe they had been the forerunners of the above, becauſe it was neceſſary to ſhow that the hatred which the people had conceived for their King, aroſe from that which had been inſtilled into them againſt their God. Thus while the declaration of this unhappy adept authenticates the conſpiracy of the Sophiſters againſt religion, it equally demonſtrates that contrived againſt the Throne.

It would be in vain to object that this unhappy man loved his King; he calls all preſent to witneſs that he is attached to the perſon of Lewis XVI.; how could he then join in a conſpiracy againſt him? But it is in vain, all is conſiſtent, all is combined in this mind racked with remorſe. This unhappy Secretary of the Conſpiring Academy might have loved the perſon of the Monarch, but deteſted Monarchy, deteſted it at leaſt as it exiſted, and in the light in which his maſters had taught him to conſider it, that is to ſay, as irreconcilable with their principles of Liberty, Equality, and Sovereignty of the people. We ſhall ſee hereafter, that opinions differed very much in this ſecret academy. Some wiſhed to have a King, or at leaſt to preſerve the appearance of one in the new projected order of things; others, and they were to carry the day, objected to the very name or any appearance of Royalty, and both parties were

were unanimous in their attacks againſt Royalty as then exiſting. The one wiſhed for a Revolution partly combined of Monteſquieu's ſyſtem, partly of Jean Jaques's. The other wiſhed to eſtabliſh it on the conſequences which Jean Jaques had deduced from Monteſquieu's principles. But both were leagued in Rebellion, and both conſpired to bring about a Revolution. The repenting adept wanted a half Revolution, nor did he believe that the people, when put in motion, would proceed to thoſe exceſſes which he deteſted. He flattered himſelf that the Conſpiring Philoſophers who ſtirred up the populace would be able to direct its motions; that they would inſpire this populace with a proper reſpect for the perſon and even for the dignity of a Prince whom he loved and reſpected as a Frenchman and a Courtier, while as a Sophiſter he dethroned him. This is all that his remorſe and his proteſtations of attachment for the perſon of Lewis XVI. can indicate. He wiſhed to make him a King ſubſervient to the views and ſyſtems of the Sophiſters, and he reduced the unfortunate Monarch to be the object of the licentious outrages of the populace; ſuch are the real cauſes of his grief and remorſe.

But the more this remnant of affection for his King appears in his declaration, the more it corroborates his avowal. It is not without cauſe that a man accuſes himſelf of having pierced the boſom

of

of the perſon he loves, or of having been concerned in a conſpiracy againſt a Monarch whoſe Throne he with regret beholds menaced with ruin. People do not accuſe themſelves of crimes which they deteſt. Let us weigh the declaration of the repenting adept. What has Condorcet, proud and vainly exulting in the Conſpiracy of Philoſophiſm againſt the Throne, told us, which the unhappy Le Roi ſinking under ſhame and remorſe has not confirmed?

Their teſtimonies compared.

The haughty adept tells us, that of the diſciples of Voltaire and Monteſquieu, that is to ſay, of all the principal authors of that impiety and ſophiſticated polity of the age, a ſchool or ſect was formed uniting and combining their labors and their writings to effectuate the ſucceſſive overthrow of the religion of Chriſt and of the Thrones of Kings. The repentant adept ſhows us theſe ſame diſciples of Voltaire, Monteſquieu, and Jean Jaques, uniting and coaleſcing under the fictitious name of Œconomiſts at the Hotel d'Holbach; and he ſays it was there that the adepts dedicated their labors and their lucubrations to the perverſion of the public opinion on the ſacred ſubjects of Religion and the rights of the Throne. "Moſt of thoſe "works (his declaration ſays) which have appeared "for a long time paſt againſt *religion, morality,* "*and government,* were ours, or thoſe of Authors "devoted to us. They were compoſed by the "mem-

" members or by the orders of the ſociety *." The unhappy Le Roi not only ſays againſt religion and morality, but alſo againſt *government*; and had he not ſaid it, the one would be the natural conſequence of the other; for the greateſt part of the writings iſſued from this club of the Baron d'Holbach unite both objects. Soon we ſhall ſee them equally aiming at the overthrow of the Throne and of the Altar. They were the ſame Sophiſters who had combined in one and the ſame plot the deſtruction of both.

The adept Condorcet complacently dwells on the art with which the coaleſced Sophiſters directed their attacks now at the Clergy then at Kings; covering truth with a veil which ſpared the eye that was too weak, artfully careſſing religious opinions, to ſtrike at them more ſurely, ſtirring up with ſtill greater art Princes againſt the Prieſthood, and the People againſt their Princes, fully reſolved to overturn both the Altar of the Prieſt and the Throne of the Prince. Are not theſe the ſame ſtratagems which the repenting adept deſcribes when he ſays, " before theſe impious and " ſeditious books were ſent to the preſs, they " were delivered in at our office. There we re- " viſed and corrected them, added to or curtailed " them according as *circumſtances* required. When

* See Part the 1ſt of theſe Memoirs, page 325.

" our

" our Philoſophy was too glaring for the times, " or for the object of the work, we brought it to " a lower tint; and when we thought that we " might be more daring than the Author, we " ſpoke more openly *." As to its object, its means, and its authors, we ſee the account of this double conſpiracy perfectly coinciding, whether given by the haughty Condorcet or the repenting Le Roi. Both demonſtrate this ſchool conſpiring againſt their God and againſt their King, flattering themſelves with ſucceſs againſt Monarchy, and generating that Revolution which was to overturn their thrones, but not till that period when the faith of nations, long before diſordered, weakened, and at length miſled by the ſnares of the Sophiſters, threatened but a ſlight reſiſtance to their attacks either againſt the Altar or the Throne.

The enthuſiaſtic pride of Condorcet, and the ſhame and remorſe of the penitent Le Roi, certainly had never concerted this conſiſtency in their depoſitions. The one, hardened in impiety and rebellion, preſerves his ſecret till that period when he thinks he may violate it without endangering the ſucceſs of his wicked purſuits. He enjoys at length, he glories in this ſucceſs, and repreſents his accomplices as men to be revered as the benefactors of mankind. The other, as it were to

* See Part the 1ſt of theſe Memoirs, page 325.

exte-

extenuate his crime, the very inſtant his eyes are open to the heinouſneſs of his paſt conduct, names thoſe who have ſeduced him, diſcloſes the place where they conſpired, but to curſe it; and throws all the weight of his crimes on his perfidious maſters, on Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, and their accomplices. He beholds theſe men who have ſeduced him in no other light than as monſters of rebellion. When ſuch oppoſite paſſions, ſuch different intereſts and ſentiments agree in their depoſitions on the ſame conſpiracy, on the ſame means, and on the ſame conſpirators, truth can require no further proofs; it is evidence, it is demonſtration itſelf.

Firſt ſteps of the Conſpiracy compared.

Such then is the firſt problem of that Revolution ſo fatal to Monarchy. Voltaire forwards it with all his might in conſpiring againſt his God, in ſpreading his doctrine of modern liberty and in artfully attacking with his ſarcaſtic wit and ſatire the pretended deſpots of his own country and of Europe. Monteſquieu traced in his ſyſtems the firſt ſteps toward that diſorganizing liberty. Jean Jaques adopts Monteſquieu's principles and enlarges on their conſequences. From the Equality of the *legiſlative* people, he deduces the Equality and Liberty of the *ſovereign* people; from the people eſſentially free and exerciſing the right of depoſing their Kings at pleaſure, he teaches the people to govern without them. The diſciples of

of Voltaire, Monteſquieu, and Jean Jaques, united and coaleſced in their ſecret academy, league alſo in their oaths; and of thoſe oaths that of cruſhing Chriſt and of annihilating Kings form but one. Had the proofs of theſe plots been ſupported neither by the boaſting of the haughty Sophiſter exulting in ſucceſs, nor by the declaration of the penitent adept ready to expire at the ſight of ſuch ſucceſſes, ſtill what we have to unfold of this mazy coalition, would equally demonſtrate both its exiſtence and its object from the publicity of the means employed by the ſect.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Fourth Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.

Inundation of Antimonarchical Books.

Freſh Proofs of the Conſpiracy.

THE very fact of the Conſpiracy againſt Monarchy having been carried on by the ſame men and in the ſame ſecret academy where the Antichriſtian Conſpiracy had been debated and conducted with ſuch unrelenting fury, will induce the reader to ſuppoſe that many of the artifices employed againſt the Altar were equally directed againſt the Throne. The moſt fatal attack on Chriſtianity, and on which the Sophiſters had beſtowed their chief attention, was that which they made with the greateſt ſucceſs to imbue the minds of the people with the ſpirit of inſurrection and revolt. Nothing proves this with more certainty than the care with which they combined their attacks againſt the Throne with thoſe againſt the Altar, in that inundation of Antichriſtian writings which we have ſeen flowing like a torrent through every claſs of ſociety. This ſecond inundation of Antimonarchical writings, by which the Sophiſters were

The authors identically the ſame in both conſpiracies.

were in hopes of perverting that ſentiment of confidence and reſpect, which the people had for their Sovereign, into hatred and contempt, was only a continuation of thoſe means which they had employed againſt their God. Theſe writings are iſſued from the ſame manufactory, compoſed by the ſame adepts, recommended and reviewed by the ſame chiefs, ſpread with the ſame profuſion, hawked about from the town to the village by the ſame agents of Holbach's Club, ſent free of coſt to the country ſchool-maſters, that all claſſes of people from the higheſt to the moſt indigent might imbibe the venom of their Sophiſtry. As it is certain that theſe writings were the grand means of the Sophiſters in their conſpiracy againſt Chriſt, ſo it is equally certain, that theſe ſame productions, monſtrous digeſts of the principles of impiety and of thoſe of rebellion, are irrefragable proofs that theſe ſame Sophiſters had combined the moſt impious of plots againſt their God with the moſt odious machinations againſt all Kings.

Why their attacks on the Throne are manifeſted ſo late.

One only difference is to be obſerved, that the firſt productions of the Secret Society were not ſo ſtrongly tainted with the blaſt of rebellion. The grand attack againſt Monarchy was reſerved until the ſect ſhould have reaſon to expect that their principles of impiety had prepared the multitude for their declamations againſt Royalty, as they had gradually ſwoln in thoſe againſt the pretended ſuperſtitions

perſtitions of Chriſtianity. Moſt of thoſe violent declamations againſt Sovereigns are poſterior not only to Monteſquieu's and Rouſſeau's ſyſtems, but even to the year 1761, when we beheld Voltaire reproaching the Sophiſters with ſeeing every thing topſy-turvy, becauſe in ſome of their writings they trenched upon the Royal Prerogative.

The Philoſophers of the Encyclopedia had only alluded very faintly, in their firſt edition of that incoherent compilation, to the principles of that Liberty and Equality which have been ſince ſo much extolled by the enemies of Royalty; though it was a cauſe of reproach to D'Alembert, that even in his preliminary diſcourſe *he ſees but a barbarous right in the inequality of ſtations*; and though the Royaliſt or even the Subject of every ſtate, of every Government, might have objected to the inſertion in the Encyclopedia of that propoſition which the Jacobins have ſince ſo often repeated, "that the ſubjection in which every man is born "with reſpect to his father or to his Prince, has "never been looked upon as a tie binding unleſs "by his own conſent*." In ſhort, though the Encyclopediſts were the firſt to enter the liſts in defence of Monteſquieu, yet the fear of alarming the public authorities made them act with great

In the divers editions of the Encyclopedia.

* See the Philoſophical Memoirs of the Baron XX. Chap. 2, on the Art. GOVERNMENT of the Encyclopedia.

circumſpection during many years on this ſubject. It was neceſſary to wait for new editions. That of Iverdun was ſtill too early; and it was in the edition of Geneva that theſe revolutionary principles firſt made their appearance. Leſt they ſhould eſcape the notice of the reader, Diderot had repeated and condenſed the poiſon, had decked them with all the array of Sophiſtry in at leaſt three different articles*. There neither Monteſquieu, Jean Jaques, nor all the admirers of the legiſlative and ſovereign multitude, could have cavilled at a ſingle link in this brilliant concatenation of Sophiſms. This perhaps might have given riſe to thoſe fears which Voltaire expreſſes in his correſpondence with D'Alembert, leſt this edition ſhould not obtain the free circulation which he wiſhed for in France. Theſe fears, however, were ill grounded, for it became the moſt common in uſe; but at that period, that is to ſay, in 1773, the Conſpirators had begun the inundation of thoſe Antimonarchical Writings from the ſecret academy, which the ſlighteſt examination will prove to have had no other tendency, as Le Roi has ſince declared, than to overthrow religion, morals, and *government*, and particularly thoſe governments where the chief power is inveſted in the Monarch.

* See Edition of Geneva Articles, DROIT DE GENS, EPICURÉENS, ECLECTIQUES.

In

In order to ſhow their concert on this laſt object as we have on the other two, let us ſuppreſs, if poſſible, the indignation which muſt naturally ariſe on reciting the leſſons of the Sophiſters. Let us ſay to all ſubjects of Monarchies, to all ſubjects of Ariſtocracies, and even of all Republicans not as yet jacobinized, 'If you tremble at the ſight of revolutions which menace your government, learn at leaſt to know the ſect which prepares theſe revolutions by means of the principles which it artfully inſinuates.' Concert of the Sophiſters againſt every government exiſting.

All religions and all governments are equally doomed to deſtruction by the Sophiſters. They wiſh to eſtabliſh every where a new order of things both in church and ſtate. We ſee them all, or nearly all, teaching us, that there ſcarcely exiſts a ſingle ſtate on the whole globe where the rights of the equal and ſovereign people are not moſt intolerably infringed. If we are to believe their writings and aſſertions, almoſt literally repeated by a ſwarm of theſe Sophiſters, "ignorance, "fear, chance, folly, ſuperſtition, and the im-"prudent gratitude of nations, have every where "directed the eſtabliſhment as well as the refor-"mation of governments." Theſe have been the ſole origin of all ſocieties, and of all empires which have exiſted until the preſent day. Such is the aſſertion of the *Social Syſtem* which the ſecret academy publiſhed as a Continuation of the

Social Contract of Jean Jaques; ſuch are the leſſons taught *in the Eſſay on Prejudices*, which they gave to the public under the ſuppoſed name of Dumarſais; ſuch again is the doctrine of the *Oriental Deſpotiſm* which they attributed to Boulanger; ſuch in fine are the principles of the *Syſtem of Nature*, which Diderot, with the choſen of the elect, after having given it exiſtence, ſo carefully ſeek to circulate *.

Jean Jaques, teaching *that man is born free, and yet that he is every where in chains*, aſks *how this happens*; and anſwers, that *he is ignorant* †. His diſciples of the ſecret academy were become either more learned or more daring.

The moſt moderate of theſe Sophiſters, or at leaſt thoſe who under the ſtandard of the Œconomiſt Du Queſnay wiſhed to appear ſo, did not give the people a more flattering account of the origin or of the preſent ſtate of their governments. "It muſt be owned," they tell us by the inſipid pen of Dupont, "that the generality of nations ſtill "remain victims of an infinitude of crimes and "calamities, which could not have happened if a "well-conducted ſtudy on the law of nature, on "moral juſtice, and on real and true politics, had

* See theſe works, particularly the Social Syſtem, Chap. 2 and 3, Vol. II.

† Chap. 1, Book I. Social Contract.

"enlight-

" enlightened the majority of intellects. Here " prohibitions are extended even to thought; " their nations miſled by the ferocious love of " conqueſt, ſacrifice the ſtock of which they ſtand " moſt in need for the cultivation of their lands, " to theſe plans of uſurpation. Men are torn " from their half-inhabited deſerts, and the ſcat- " tered riches which had been ſparingly ſown are " ſeized for the purpoſe of ſhedding the blood of " neighbouring ſtates, and of multiplying elſe- " where other deſerts. On one ſide . . . . on the " other . . . . Elſewhere . . . . Elſewhere . . . ."

This ſable picture is terminated by twenty or thirty lines of dots, leaving to the imagination of the reader to fill them up, or to tell us, as the gentle author will, " *Such is ſtill the ſtate of the world;* " *ſuch has always been the ſtate of our Europe, and* " *nearly of the whole globe* *."

The reader will remark, that the men who broach ſuch doctrines on Governments, and wiſh to inſtil them into the people, take care to inſert them in thoſe works which are peculiarly devoted to the inſtruction of country farmers. He will alſo remark how exactly they follow the ſteps of their maſter Jean Jaques. This latter, refuſing to except England from the general ſentence, that

Particularly againſt the Engliſh government.

* Ephemerides du Citoyen, Vol. VII. Operations de L'Europe.

man was every where in chains, did not heſitate at ſaying, " The people of England deceive themſelves when they fancy they are free: they are ſo, in fact, only during the interval between a diſſolution of one Parliament and the election of another; for, as ſoon as a new one is elected, *they are again in chains and loſe all their virtue as a people*. And thus, by the uſe they make of their few moments of liberty, they deſerve to loſe it *."

Reflecting adepts would have queſtioned Jean Jaques to know how his equal and ſovereign people could enjoy a greater degree of Liberty than the Engliſh, and how it came to paſs that they were not as much enſlaved every where elſe as they were in their aſſemblies, ſince it was only in theſe aſſemblies that the people *could exerciſe their ſovereignty*; and in theſe aſſemblies even their ſovereignty was null, their acts were illegitimate and void unleſs they *had been convoked by the proper Magiſtrate*; ſince on all other occaſions the ſole duty of this ſovereign people was to obey †? But our paſſive adepts preferred viewing the Engliſh Government in the light of one that was to be cried down with the reſt. " Nations even that " flatter themſelves with being the beſt governed,

* Social Contract, Chap. 15, Book III.

† Chap. 12 and 13, Book III.

" ſuch

" ſuch as England, for example, *have no further* " *pleaſure* but that of perpetually ſtruggling againſt " the Sovereign Power, and of rendering their " natural impoſts inadequate to the public expen- " diture.—Of ſeeing both their preſent and future " revenues, the fortunes and manſions of their " poſterity, in ſhort of half their iſland, ſold and " alienated by their repreſentatives, &c.—Eng- " land at this price, too dear by three fourths, " forms a Republic, in which, luckily for her, *a* " *couple of excellent laws* are to be found; but as " to her conſtitution, notwithſtanding all that " Monteſquieu has ſaid to the contrary, it does " not appear much to be envied *."

Our reſpect for that nation forbids us to continue our citations from this declamatory work.—What we have already quoted will ſuffice to ſhow how much the Sophiſters wiſhed by means of theſe ſcurrilous harangues to perſuade all nations, that, ſince the ſovereignty of the people was ſo ſtrangely violated even in England, and if it was neceſſary for her to overthrow her conſtitution to re-eſtabliſh the people in their rights, how much greater muſt be the neceſſity of a Revolution for all other nations being their ſole hope of breaking their chains.

* Dupont on the Republic of Geneva, Chap. IV.

Hatred of the Sophiſters againſt all Kings.

This was only an indirect attack of the Sophiſters againſt Kings, under whoſe Government moſt nations live. Nor muſt the reader expect to ſee Philoſophiſm circumſcribing its effects to render every throne odious, within the narrow ſphere of commenting on the ſeditious parts of Monteſquieu, Jean Jaques, or Voltaire.

Helvetius and many others.

Monteſquieu had repreſented prejudice as the prime mover of Monarchies. He had declared that it was very difficult for *a people to be virtuous* under that form of Government. Helvetius, ſallying forth from his ſecret academy, and carrying theſe principles to greater lengths, exclaims, "The true *Monarchy* is no more than a Conſti-"tution invented *to corrupt the morals of nations* "*and to enſlave them*; witneſs the Romans when "they gave a King or a Deſpot to the Spartans "and Britons *."

Jean Jaques had taught nations, that if *the authority of Kings* came from God, it was by the ſame channel through which *ſickneſs* and other public ſcourges came †.—Raynal follows him to inform us, that "*theſe Kings are wild beaſts who* "*devour nations* ‡." A third Sophiſter preſents himſelf who tells us, all "*your Kings are the*

* Of man, note to Sect. 9, Vol. II.

† Emile, Vol. IV. and Social Contract.

‡ Philoſophical and Political Hiſtory, &c. Book XIX. Vol. IV.

"*firſt*

" *firſt executioners of their ſubjects; and force and* " *ſtupidity were the founders of their thrones* *."—
Another tells us, " Kings are like Saturn in the " Heathen Mythology, who devours his own " children;" others again ſay, " the Monarchical " form of Government, placing ſuch great force " in the hands of one man, muſt by its very na- " ture tempt him to abuſe his power; and by " that means, placing himſelf above the laws, he " will exerciſe *Tyranny and Deſpotiſm*, which are " the *two greateſt calamities that can befall a ſtate* †." The moſt moderate of their declamations on Royalty ſuppoſes *too great a diſtance between the Sovereign and the Subject* for it ever to be looked upon as a wiſe Government ‡; and that if a King be abſolutely neceſſary, we never ſhould forget, that he only ought to be *the firſt Commiſſioner of the nation* §.

But this neceſſity grieved the Sophiſters to ſuch a degree, that, to make their countrymen triumph over it, they inceſſantly repeat that France is under the yoke of *Deſpotiſm, whoſe peculiar property is to debaſe the mind and degrade the ſoul*; that their country even, governed by Kings, can find no remedy for its *misfortunes* but in falling *a prey to a*

* Syſtem of Reaſon.

† See Eſſay on Prejudice, the Oriental Deſpotiſm, and Social Syſtem, Chap. 2 and 3. ‡ Ibid.

§ Helvetius on Man.

foreign

foreign enemy; that as long as they are ſwayed by the ſcepter of Kings, "they are *invincibly* and by "the *very form of government brought down to brutal* "*degradation.* That it is in vain to diffuſe light "on *the French*, as it will only ſhow them the "misfortunes of Deſpotiſm without enabling them "to withdraw from its oppreſſion."

What they ſay to their countrymen they proclaim to all the nations of the earth. They have conſecrated whole volumes to perſuade them *that it is a puſillanimous fear alone that has created and* Raynal. *ſtill maintains Kings on their thrones* *. They proclaim to the Engliſh, the Spaniards, the Pruſſians, the Auſtrians, indiſcriminately with the French, *that the people are as much ſlaves in Europe as they are in America*; that the only advantage *they enjoy over the Negroes is, that they may leave one chain to take another.* They proclaim that the *inequality of power* in any ſtate whatever, and particularly the reunion of the ſupreme power in their chiefs, is *the height of folly*; that that ſpirit of *Liberty* and of *Independence* which cannot bear with a ſuperior, much leſs with Kings and Sovereigns, *is the inſtinct of nature enlightened by reaſon.* They brandiſh that *parallel ſword* which was to glide along the heads of

* See the Oriental Deſpotiſm in particular.

Kings,

Kings, and mow off thoſe which *roſe above the horizontal plane* *.

If nations, wiſe in experience, and deſpiſing the declamations of a ſeditious Philoſophiſm, ſought an aſylum under the protection of a King, or if to cruſh anarchy they had extended the authority of the Monarch, it was then that one might behold the adepts exclaiming in their rage; "at "this humiliating ſight (of a nation of the North, "of Sweden, re-eſtabliſhing the rights of its Mo-"narch), who is there that does not aſk himſelf, "*what then is man?* What is that profound and "original ſenſe of dignity with which he is ſup-"poſed to be endowed? Is he then born for inde-"pendence or for ſlavery? What then is that "ſilly flock, called a nation. Mean populace! "ſilly flock! What, content to groan when you "ought to roar? cowardly, ſtupid populace! "ſince this perpetual oppreſſion gives you no "energy—ſince you are millions, and, neverthe-"leſs, ſuffer a dozen of children (called Kings) "armed with little ſticks (called Scepters) to lead "you as they pleaſe; obey, but ſubmit without "importuning us with your complaints, and learn "to be unhappy, if you don't know how to be "free †."

* See Philoſophical and Political Hiſtory, by Raynal, &c. Vol. III. and IV. *paſſim*. † Ibid.

Had

Had every nation murdered its Sovereign at the time when Philoſophiſm broached ſuch doctrine, what would they have done more than practiſe the leſſons of the Sophiſters? When we ſee that it was the very leaders of the ſect who held ſuch language, an Helvetius or a Boulanger, a Diderot or a Raynal; when we know that it was thoſe very productions in which ſuch ſentiments were advanced that endeared them to the ſect, what can we ſuppoſe was the meaning of this concert, of this union of the moſt celebrated adepts? What could be their plans? Where did they aim their blows, if not at the Throne as well as the Altar? Was it not againſt them that their rage was conſtantly let looſe? What other Revolution did they meditate, if not that which buries the altar and the throne beneath the ruins of the ſtate?

I know what is incumbent on Hiſtory to add with reſpect to ſome of theſe Sophiſters, to Raynal for example. I know that when this adept beheld the Revolution, he ſhuddered at the ſight of its exceſſes, that he even ſhed tears; and that when he appeared at the bar of the new Legiſlators, he dared reproach them with having o'erſtepped the limits which Philoſophy had preſcribed. But this apparition of Raynal at the bar, or rather this comic ſcene, which had been vainly prepared by the humbled and jealous Revolutioniſts, in oppoſition to the Revolutioniſts triumphant in their ſucceſſes, only furniſhes us with

with a new proof of the plots of the Sophiſters.—For it was in their name that Raynal dares addreſs the new Legiſlators, ſaying, 'That is not what we wiſhed for; you have broken through the Revotionary line which we had traced *.' What can ſuch

* Let the reader conſult the diſcourſe he pronounced at the bar of the National Aſſembly, and he will find that the whole drift of his ſpeech turns on thoſe two lines. I know that this Sophiſter at his retreat near Paris wept bitterly on the exceſſes of the Revolution, that he threw the fault principally on the French Calviniſts, and cried out, "It is thoſe wretches, "I ſee it clearly, it is thoſe men for whom I have done ſo "much, that plunge us into all theſe horrid ſcenes." Theſe words were related to me by an Attorney-General of the Parliament of Grenoble on the very day he had heard them, and a few days before the famous 10th of Auguſt 1792. But what do ſuch tears prove? Without doubt Raynal and his brotherhood did not wiſh for all thoſe butcheries, the infamy of which he wiſhes to throw upon the Calviniſts. But Rabaud de St. Etienne, Barnave, and the other Calviniſts, whether deputies, actors, or leaders, were not the only men formed by his Philoſophy. The maſters wiſhed for a Revolution after their faſhion, but the diſciples conſummate it according to their own ideas. And by what right can thoſe men who have formed the rebel, complain of the exceſſes, crimes, and atrocious deeds of his rebellion! Obſerve—We are told alſo, that in the end Raynal returned to his religion. He would be another great example to be added to La Harpe. If this be really the fact, if even thoſe who have ſo greatly contributed to the Revolution by their impiety acknowledge that to return to that God they begun by deſerting, is the only means of expiating their crime, how culpable is it in thoſe who, after

ſuch language mean, and are we not authorized to anſwer the man who holds it, 'Theſe rebels do not follow the line which you and your ſages had traced for the Revolution! There was then a Revolution which you and your ſages had meditated and planned. Are the plans of Revolutions againſt Kings carried on without the plots of rebellion? Could thoſe Revolutions which you planned differ from thoſe which your leſſons on Liberty and Equality prognoſticated! or, when you brand every nation which ſuffers itſelf to be governed by its lawful King, or which *contents itſelf with groaning when it ought to roar* againſt its Sovereign, with the appellation of *a ſilly flock of cowards?*— And when theſe nations begin to roar why ſhould you complain? So far from having tranſgreſſed the bounds you had preſcribed, our Legiſlative Jacobins have not yet attained the goal you had pointed out. The *parallel ſword* has not yet glided over the heads of Kings; wait then till there ſhall not exiſt a ſingle King upon earth; and even then, ſo far from having overſhot your doctrines, Jacobiniſm will only have followed them to the very letter.'

after having fallen a ſacrifice to that Revolution, expoſe even in exile their impiety to public view! How unfortunate is it for them to be at once the victim of the Jacobin and the ſcandal of the Chriſtian!

To

To ſuch an anſwer, which Raynal ſo richly deſerved, the National Aſſembly might have added, 'Before you complain, begin by thanking us for the juſtice we have rendered you. One of our members *, friendly to Philoſophers like you, has repreſented to us the injuſtice of Kings whom you had ſet at defiance, he has ſhown us in your perſon the ſacred liberty of Philoſophy oppreſſed by Deſpotiſm. At the very name of Philoſopher, we diſcovered our maſter, the worthy rival of Voltaire, D'Alembert, Jean Jaques, and of ſo many others, whoſe writings and concert haſtened our ſucceſſes. We have liſtened to the prayer of your friends, we have reſtored you to Liberty under the eye of that very King, whom you taught us to revile, go and peacefully enjoy the advantages of friendſhip, and of the decrees of the national aſſembly, while it will continue to run the courſe which you have marked out.'

Thus even the vain proteſtations of humiliated Philoſophiſm, reduced to bluſh at the exceſſes naturally attendant on its doctrines, every thing in ſhort concurs to demonſtrate the exiſtence of their Conſpiracies.

But partial attacks of the adepts are not ſufficient; the reader muſt behold them encouraging each other, preſſing the execution of their plots,

* The honour of Raynal's recall was attributed to Mr. Malouet.

and

and the inſurrection of the people againſt their Sovereigns. Let him hear the ſame Raynal convoking the adepts, and calling out to them, "Sages of the earth, *Philoſophers of* ALL NATIONS, "make thoſe mercenary ſlaves bluſh who are al- "ways ready to exterminate their fellow citizens "at the command of their maſters. Make na- "ture and humanity riſe in their ſouls againſt "ſuch a perverſion of the ſocial laws. Learn that "*liberty is the gift of God*, but *authority the inven- "tion of man*. Bare to the light *thoſe myſteries "which encompaſs the univerſe with chains and "darkneſs*; and may the people, learning how "much their credulity has been impoſed upon, "avenge the glory of the human ſpecies *."

The art and ſolicitude with which the Sophiſters ſeek to preclude Kings from the ſuccour they might one day have drawn from the fidelity of their troops, is worthy of attention. We ſee in theſe diſcourſes by what means the French army firſt imbibed thoſe principles which have been ſo often and ſo ſucceſsfully employed by the revolutioniſts to reſtrain and damp their courage and their activity. We ſee how they ſucceeded in repreſenting as rebels ſo many of their brethren, againſt whom humanity, nature, and the ſocial laws, forbad them to turn their arms, though it

* Ibid. Vol. I.

were

were to defend the life and authority of their lawful Sovereign. We ſee theſe Sophiſters bearing down all oppoſition, and preparing a free courſe for all the fury of that horde of rebels or of pretended patriots, that they might brandiſh, without fear, the hatchet and the pike. The reader may obſerve them diſpoſing the armies meanly to betray their Sovereigns under the pretence of fraternizing with rebels and aſſaſſins.

To theſe villanous precautions, which deſtroyed in the rebels the fear of the Royal forces, let us add the pains they took to rob Kings of what ſupport religion and Heaven itſelf might have given them, that affectation of extinguiſhing all remorſe in rebellion, and of pointing out the God who protects Kings as an object of deteſtation. How could it be poſſible for us to miſtake the double tendency of doctrines at once dictated by the phrenzy of rebellion and of impiety!

Diderot's doctrines on Kings.

" It is only in a numerous, fixed, and civilized " ſtate of ſociety, that, wants daily multiplying, " and intereſts differing, Governments have been " obliged to have recourſe to laws, public forms " of worſhip, and uniform ſyſtems of religion. " It is then that the governors of the people in- " voke that *fear of inviſible powers, to reſtrain* " *them, to render them docile, and to oblige them to* " *live in peace.* It is thus that morality and policy " form a part of the religious ſyſtem. *Chiefs of*

" *nations*, often ſuperſtitious themſelves, little ac-
" quainted with their own intereſts, or verſed in
" ſound morality, and blind to the real agents,
" believe they ſecure their own authority as well
" as the happineſs and peace of ſociety at large,
" by immerging their ſubjects in ſuperſtition, by
" threatening them with their inviſible phantoms
" (of their divinity) and by treating them like
" children, who are quieted by means of fables
" and chimeras. Under the ſhadow of ſuch ſur-
" prizing inventions, and of which the chiefs
" themſelves are often dupes, tranſmitting them
" from generation to generation, Sovereigns be-
" lieve themſelves excuſed from ſeeking any far-
" ther inſtruction. They neglect the laws, they
" enervate themſelves in luxury, and are ſlaves to
" their caprices. They confide in the gods for
" the government of their people. They deliver
" over the inſtruction of their ſubjects to prieſts
" who are to render them very devout and ſub-
" miſſive, and teach them from their earlieſt
" youth to tremble both before the viſible and in-
" viſible gods.

" It is thus that nations are kept in a perpetual
" awe by their governors, and are only reſtrained
" by vain chimeras. When the happineſs of man
" ſhall become the object of real inveſtigation, it
" will be with *the gods of heaven* that the reform
" muſt begin. *No good ſyſtem of government can*

be

" *be founded on a deſpotic god; he will always make* " *tyrants of his repreſentatives.*"

Is it poſſible to combine their attacks in a more villanous manner againſt the God of heaven and the powers of the earth? Tyrants or Kings have invented a god, and this god and his prieſts ſupport alone the authority of theſe Kings and Tyrants. This perfidious aſſertion is perpetually repeated throughout the famous Syſtem of Nature, and this is the work which the ſecret academy diſſeminates with the greateſt profuſion. But neither Diderot nor his aſſociates will heſitate at going to much greater lengths, notwithſtanding the height to which they had carried their hatred in this famous ſyſtem. If we are to believe them, all the vices and crimes of Tyrants, the oppreſſion and misfortunes of the People, all originate in the attributes of the juſtice of the God of the Goſpel. That God of *vengeance*, ſo terrible to the wicked; that God, the *remunerator*, the conſolation, and the hope of the juſt man, is in the eyes of the Sophiſter *no more than a chimerical and capricious being, ſolely uſeful to Kings and Prieſts.* It is becauſe Prieſts are perpetually ſtunning both Kings and People with this God of *vengeance* and *remuneration* that Prieſts are wicked, Kings deſpotic and tyrannic, in ſhort the people oppreſſed. It is on that account, we ſee that *Princes even the moſt abjectly ſuperſtitious are no more than robbers; too proud*

to be humane, too great to be juſt; and who are inventing for their own uſe a particular code of perfidy, violence, and treachery. It is on this account, that nations, degraded by ſuperſtition, will ſuffer *children*, or Kings *made giddy with flattery, to govern them with an iron rod.* With this God of vengeance and remuneration, *theſe children*, or fooliſh kings *transformed into gods, are maſters of the law. It lies in their breaſt to decide what is juſt or unjuſt.* With this God *their licentiouſneſs has no bounds, becauſe they are certain of impunity—Accuſtomed to no other fear but that of God, they act as if they had nothing to fear.* This God of vengeance and remuneration is the cauſe *why hiſtory ſwarms with wicked and vicious potentates* *.

In tranſcribing theſe ſhort extracts, we have abridged prolix chapters tending to infuſe that hatred for God and kings into the minds of the people, which animated the leading adepts. Nobody could better expreſs to what degree he was inflamed by it than Diderot himſelf. We have ſeen Voltaire, in a moment of phrenſy, wiſhing to ſee the laſt Jeſuit ſtrangled with the entrails of the laſt Janſeniſt. The ſame frantic rage had inſpired Diderot with the ſame idea on Prieſts and Kings; and it was well known in Paris, that in his fits of rage he would exclaim, Ah! *when then*

* Ibid. Vol. II. Chap. 8.

ſhall

ſhall I ſee the laſt King ſtrangled with the bowels of the laſt Prieſt *!*

The reader may be ſurprized at hearing that the Syſtem of Nature was not the moſt virulent production which the Club of Holbach had publiſhed to incite the people to rebellion and to perſuade them to conſider their Kings and Princes in no other light than as monſters to be cruſhed. The adept or adepts who had compoſed the *Social Syſtem* availed themſelves of the impreſſion Diderot's work had made. They are more reſerved on Atheiſm, only to be more virulent againſt Kings. The object of this work is to perſuade the people that they are the victims of a long ſtate of warfare, which ended by throwing them under the yoke of Kings. But they were not to abandon all hope of breaking their chains, and even of loading their Kings with them, though they had been hitherto unſucceſsful. There the imagination is worked upon, and the meaneſt ſubject is taught to ſay to his Sovereign, "We have "proved the weakeſt, we have ſubmitted to "force; *but ſhould we ever become the ſtrongeſt, we*

Inflammatory doctrines of other adepts.

* It is with regret that I recollect having been credibly informed, that in the north of Ireland the diſaffected part of the inhabitants frequently gave as a toaſt, *May the guts of the laſt Biſhop ſerve as a rope to ſtrangle the laſt King.* If this be true, the reader will not be at a loſs to know whence they imbibed their principles. T.

" *would wreſt that uſurped power from you* when-
" ever you exerciſed it for our unhappineſs. It
" is only by your attention to our proſperity that
" you can make us forget *the infamous titles* by
" which you reign over us. *If we are not ſtrong*
" *enough to ſhake off the yoke we will only bear it*
" *with horror.* You ſhall find an enemy in each
" of your ſlaves, and every inſtant you ſhall trem-
" ble on the thrones which you have unlawfully
" uſurped *."

Such menaces will certainly be looked upon as the laſt ſtage of their conſpiring fury. Nevertheleſs they found a higher tone; and, to teach nations to ſhudder at the very name of Monarchy, they roar like monſters.

Many years before the French Revolution their productions had teemed with every thing that a Petion, a Condorcet, or a Marat could have invented in their frantic rage againſt Sovereigns to excite the populace to bring the head of the unfortune Lewis XVI. to the ſcaffold; ſince many years after having told us, *that truth and not politeneſs ſhould be the chief object of man,* to practiſe this doctrine they addreſs Kings, ſaying, " *Ye*
" *tigers, deified by other tigers, you expect to paſs to*
" *immortality? Yes,* anſwer they, *but as objects of*
" *execration* †."

* Social Syſtem, Chap. I. Vol. II. † Ibid. note.

With

With the ſame exceſs of phrenſy, commenting on the axiom,

Some lucky ſoldier was the firſt of Kings,

full of his Voltaire, like the Pythoneſs inſpired by the devil, from the ſummit of his fiery tripod the ſame adept, addreſſing himſelf to all nations, tells them, " Thouſands of executioners crowned " with laurel and wreaths of flowers, returning " from their expeditions, carry about in triumph " an *idol* which they call *King*, Emperor, So- " vereign. They crown this idol and proſtrate " themſelves before it, and then, at the ſound of " inſtruments, and of repeated, ſenſeleſs and bar- " barous acclamations, they declare it in future " to be the *Sovereign Director* of all the bloody " ſcenes which are to take place in the realm, " and to be *the firſt executioner of the nation.*"

Then, ſwelling his cheſt, foaming at the mouth, and with haggard eyes he makes the air reſound with the following frightful utterance:

" *To the pretended maſters of the earth*, ſcourges " of mankind, illuſtrious tyrants of your equals, " *Kings*, *Princes*, *Monarchs*, *Chiefs*, *Sovereigns*, all " you, in fine, who, raiſing yourſelves on the " throne, *and above your equals*, have loſt all *ideas* " *of equality*, equity, *ſociability* and truth; in whom " *ſociability* and goodneſs, the beginnings of the " moſt common virtues, have not even ſhown

"themſelves, I cite you all at the tribunal of "reaſon. If this miſerable globe, ſilently moving "through the etherial ſpace, drags away with it "millions of unhappy beings fixed to its ſurface, "and fettered with the bonds of opinion; if this "globe, I ſay, has been a prey to you, and if "you ſtill continue to devour this ſad inheritance, "it is not to the wiſdom of your predeceſſors, nor "to the virtues of the firſt inhabitants, that you "are indebted for it; but *to ſtupidity, to fear, to "barbarity, to perfidy, to ſuperſtition. Such are your "titles.* I am not the perſon who pronounces "againſt you; it is the oracle of ages, it is the "annals of hiſtory which depoſe againſt you. "Open them, they will aſſuredly furniſh you with "better information, and the numerous monu-"ments of our miſeries and of our errors will be "proofs which neither political pride nor fana-"ticiſm can controvert.

"Deſcend from your thrones, and, laying aſide "both ſceptre and crown, go and queſtion the "loweſt of your ſubjects; aſk him what *he really "loves, and what he hates the moſt:* he will un-"doubtedly anſwer, that he really *loves but his "equals, and that he hates his maſters* *."

It is thus that, aſſuming every tone from that of the epigram, pamphlet, romance, ſyſtem, or tragic

* Social Syſtem, page 7 and 8.

ſentence,

ſentence, to the declamations of enthuſiaſm, or the roaring of rage, Voltaire's and Monteſquieu's ſchool, ſo well deſcribed by Condorcet, had ſucceeded in inundating all France and all Europe with works naturally tending to efface from the earth the very memory of a King.

Conſequences of theſe doctrines and their concert.

To place in their true light the intention and the concert of the Sophiſters, the Hiſtorian muſt never loſe ſight of the den from whence theſe productions were iſſued, and of the art with which and the men by whom they were ſpread from the palace to the cottage: By the Secret Society of the Hotel D'Holbach, in Paris; by the numerous editions in the provincial towns; by the hawkers in the country; by D'Alembert's office of inſtruction, and tutors, in wealthy families; and by the country ſchool-maſters in the villages, and among the workmen and day-labourers*. In their various attacks, let him remark the uniformity of their principles, of their ſentiments, and of their hatred; and let him particularly remember, that the ſame authors who declaim moſt virulently againſt Kings, had already diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their hatred againſt religion. Should he heſitate at declaring the Sophiſters of impiety to be alſo the Sophiſters of rebellion; ſhould the very evidence of the conſpiracy lead him to doubt of its

* See Vol. I. Chap. XVI.

reality;

reality; in that caſe let us not refuſe to ſolve even the doubts of the hiſtorian, and may the very objections be turned into freſh demonſtrations!

New proofs drawn from the objections.

I feel that it may be objected to me, that my proofs differ in their nature from thoſe which I had chiefly drawn from the very correſpondence of the Conſpirators. In anſwer, it may be remarked, that if any cauſe of ſurprize exiſted, it would not be, that the letters of the Conſpirators made public ſhould contain nothing reſpecting the conſpiracy againſt Kings; but it would be, on the contrary, that they had furniſhed us with ſo much evidence. We may be ſurprized at the aſſurance of the editors of thoſe letters, who ſhow us Voltaire conjuring D'Alembert not to betray his ſecret on Kings, who ſhow us Voltaire panting after Republics; Voltaire bewailing the departure of thoſe adepts who were expounding the new catechiſm of Republican Liberty in Paris itſelf; Voltaire praiſed by D'Alembert for the art he diſplays in combating Kings or pretended Deſpots, and in preparing Revolutions and their boiſterous ſcenes; Voltaire, in fine, regretting that they were ſtill too diſtant for him to flatter himſelf with living to ſee them. It is this ſame correſpondence which points out D'Alembert furious at his *hands being tied*, and at not being able to deal the ſame blows on the pretended Deſpots as Voltaire did, but ſeconding him at leaſt with his wiſhes in this rebellious warfare. When all theſe letters

letters were made public by Condorcet and the other editors in 1785, Lewis XVI. was ſtill on the throne, and the Revolution at ſome diſtance. They had reaſon to fear the diſcovery of their plots; and it is eaſy to ſee, that many of the letters had been ſuppreſſed. Moſt certainly Condorcet, and the other adepts, muſt have had even then a ſtrange confidence in their ſucceſs, not to have ſuppreſſed many more. Beſides, had theſe letters been entirely ſilent as to the Conſpiracy againſt Kings, could even that ſilence invalidate the avowals of Condorcet, and of ſo many other adepts? The ſame artifices, the ſame calumnies, the ſame wiſhes againſt the Throne being combined with thoſe againſt the Altar, in the productions of the ſect, could that ſilence weaken the evidence of the common plot for the deſtruction of both?

But if theſe plots were ſo viſible, it will be ſaid, are not the Magiſtrates to be blamed for their negligence and ſilence? How was it poſſible that theſe Conſpirators could have eſcaped the ſeverity of the laws? Here it would be ſufficient to recall the favorite maxim of the Conſpirators, *Strike, but hide your hand!* It would ſuffice, were we merely to repeat Condorcet's words when, after having expoſed, in the cleareſt terms, the double conſpiracy, the labors, and the concert of the Philoſophers againſt the Altar and the Throne, he adds,

Conſpiracy denounced by the Magiſtrates.

adds, that " the *Chiefs* of the Philoſophers *always* " *had the art of eſcaping vengeance, though they ex-* " *poſed themſelves to hatred; and of eſcaping perſe-* " *cution, though ſufficiently conſpicuous to ſuffer no* " *diminution of their glory* *." But this ſilence of the Magiſtracy is a falſe imputation. The Conſpirators may have concealed themſelves from the tribunals, but the Conſpiracy was not on that account leſs evident to the ſight of the Magiſtracy; and juridical denunciations will give new force to our demonſtrations. If ſuch proofs are neceſſary for the Hiſtorian, let us tranſcribe the words of a moſt celebrated magiſtrate; let us hearken to Mr. Seguier, Attorney-General of the Parliament of Paris, denouncing on the 18th of Auguſt 1770 this very Conſpiracy of the Philoſophers.

" Since the extirpation of hereſies which have " diſturbed the peace of the church," ſaid the eloquent Magiſtrate, " we have ſeen a ſyſtem " riſing out of darkneſs, far more dangerous in " its conſequences than thoſe ancient errors, al- " ways cruſhed as faſt as they appeared. *An im-* " *pious and daring ſect has raiſed its head in the* " *midſt of us, and it has decorated its falſe wiſdom* " *with the name of Philoſophy.* Under this autho- " ritative title its diſciples pretend to all know-

* Above, Page 135.

" ledge,

" ledge. Its ſectaries have taken upon themſelves " to be the inſtructors of mankind. *Liberty in* " *thinking* is their cry, and this cry has reſound- " ed from the northern to the ſouthern pole. " *With one hand they have ſought to ſhake the Throne,* " *and with the other to overturn the Altar.* Their " object is to aboliſh all belief, and to inſtil new " ideas into the mind of man on *civil and religious* " *inſtitutions*; and this revolution may be ſaid to " have taken place; the proſelytes of the ſect have " multiplied, and their maxims are ſpread far and " wide. *Kingdoms have felt their ancient baſis* " *totter*; and nations, ſurprized to find their prin- " ciples annihilated, have aſked each other, by " what ſtrange fatality they became ſo different " from themſelves.

" Thoſe who by their talents ſhould have en- " lightened their cotemporaries, have become the " leaders of theſe unbelievers; they have hoiſted " the banner of revolt, and have thought to add " to their celebrity by this ſpirit of independence; " numberleſs obſcure ſcribblers, unable to attain " to celebrity by their abilities, have had the ſame " preſumption. In fine, religion can number " nearly as many declared enemies, as literature " can boaſt of pretended Philoſophers. *And Go-* " *vernment ſhould tremble* at tolerating in its boſom " ſuch an inflammatory ſect of unbelievers, whoſe

" ſole

" ſole object appears to be to *ſtir up the people to* " *rebellion, under pretence of enlightening them* *."

This formal denunciation of the double Conſpiracy of the Sophiſters was grounded on the peculiar attention which they paid to the propagation of their impious and regicide principles in their daily productions, and more particularly in thoſe which this great lawyer preſented to the Court as moſt deſerving of animadverſion.

Foremoſt among thoſe productions ſtood a work of Voltaire's, the honorary preſident of Holbach's club. It was one of the moſt impious of all, and bore the title of "*God and Men.*" The ſecond, *Chriſtianity Unveiled*, had been written by Damilaville, a zealous adept of that club. The third, the pretended *Critical Examination*, was publiſhed by this ſame club under the name of Freret, as the repenting Secretary *Le Roi* declared. The fourth was the famous *Syſtem of Nature* written by Diderot, and two others of this ſecret academy.— So true it is, that moſt of that peſtilential blight both of Impiety and Rebellion which has overſpread the greateſt part of Europe, proceeded from that den of Conſpirators †.

* Suit of the 18th Auguſt 1770.

† There were alſo ſome few books tranſlated from the Engliſh: But ſuch only as are caſt aſide with abhorrence in England for their impiety; that however was the greateſt of all recommendations with Voltaire and the club.

" From

" From theſe different productions." continued the Magiſtrate, " a ſyſtem of the moſt flagitious " doctrine may be collected, which *invincibly* " *proves*, that their propoſed object is not to de- " ſtroy the Chriſtian Religion only—Impiety has " not limited its plans of innovation ſolely to its " dominion over the minds of men. *Its reſtleſs* " *and enterprizing genius, averſe to all dependence,* " *aſpires at the overthrow of every political inſtitu-* " *tion, and its wiſhes will only then be fulfilled when* " *it ſhall have thrown the Legiſlative and Executive* " *Powers into the hands of the People, when it ſhall* " *have deſtroyed the neceſſary inequality of ranks and* " *ſtations; when it ſhall have reviled the Majeſty of* " *Kings, and have rendered their authority preca-* " *rious and dependent on the caprice of a blind multi-* " *tude; when, in fine, by theſe aſtoniſhing changes, it* " *ſhall have immerſed the whole world in the horrors* " *of Anarchy with all its concomitant evils.*"

To theſe denunciations of the public Magiſtrate may be added thoſe of the general aſſemblies of the Clergy, thoſe of a great many Biſhops in their paſtoral letters, thoſe, in ſhort, of the Sorbonne and of every religious orator or author, who never ceaſed refuting the Sophiſters of the day, whether in their theſes, their writings, or from the pulpit. It would be vain to ſay, that theſe denunciations were only made by people ſeeking to ſtrengthen their own cauſe by confounding it with

that

that of Kings. But are we not to hearken to an adverſary even, when he ſpeaks for us as well as for himſelf, and when he produces proofs. It would be imprudence in the extreme not to hearken, and even ſecond him, when he comes and ſays, 'You are leagued with my greateſt enemies, but they are equally yours; I forewarn you of their hoſtile intentions; and if they have conſpired againſt me, it is only to aſcertain the ſucceſs of the plots they have formed againſt you *.' It would have been eaſy to diſcriminate, whether the Clergy denouncing theſe conſpiracies were actuated by ſelf-intereſt or the love of truth; a ſlight examination of the proofs adduced in teſtimony of their denunciations would have ſufficed. Theſe proofs were all drawn from the productions of the ſect, from productions replete with ſarcaſtic declamation and calumny againſt Sovereigns, with invitations to the people to rebellion, ſowing in the ſame page the ſeeds of Anarchy with thoſe of Impiety. And theſe were evidently the two-fold productions of the ſame men, of the ſame academy of authors, of the ſame conſpirators. Were not the Clergy then authorized to point out theſe ſame Sophiſters as brandiſhing the torch, on one ſide to

* See the acts of the Aſſemblies of the Clergy, 1770. The paſtoral letters of Mr. de Beaumont, archbiſhop of Paris. The ſermons of Pere Neuville, the works of the Abbé Bergier and of many others.

ſpread

ſpread the blaze throughout the temple, on the other to kindle the flames which were to reduce the royal crown and ſceptre to aſhes *? Might they not be ſaid to have conſpired more deſperately againſt the throne than againſt the altar, and might not the latter conſpiracy have been merely a preparatory ſtep to the completion of the former? So far then from excluding the deſtruction of the Throne from their wiſhes, and confining them to the overthrow of Religion, ſay that to overturn Government was their chief object: Examine and compare their doctrines, behold their concert, their conſtancy, their aſſurance, and then candidly pronounce.

But the evidence of the Clergy ſhall, if it be required, be thrown aſide as ſuſpicious, though it is now too late to attaint it with falſhood. Will the teſtimony of a man who certainly had every reaſon to ſpare the ſect be alſo thrown aſide? I have heard it aſked, How it was poſſible, ſince the Sophiſters were ſaid to have conſpired againſt the throne, that Frederic II. the Royal Sophiſter, could have been deceived by and could have leagued during ſo long a time with the ſworn ene- Teſtimony of the King of Pruſſia.

* The burning of the crown and ſceptre, with the other attributes of ſovereignty, has been one of the favourite ceremonies of the Revolutionary Agents. In France the crown and ſceptre, at Venice and Genoa the chair and golden book were burnt. T.

mies of his throne, in ſhort with the Sophiſters of Rebellion? But ſuch an objection will only ſerve to throw new light on the Conſpiracy. Let the Royal Sophiſter be the accuſer, let him cover his Sophiſtical Maſters with ridicule. The inveteracy of his hatred againſt religion, his protection of the irreligious Encyclopediſts, all his conduct in ſhort, will corroborate his teſtimony when he paints theſe Sophiſters as empty ſages conſpiring equally againſt the altar and the throne. And the time came when Frederic II. perceived that his dear Philoſophers, by initiating him into their myſteries of Impiety, had let him into but half their ſecret; that by employing his power to cruſh Chriſt, they had planned the deſtruction of his throne and the extirpation of Monarchy. Frederic was not the repenting adept, like the unhappy Le Roi, for his ſoul was too deeply immerſed in impiety; but he was certainly aſhamed of having been ſo ſtrangely duped. Indignation and revenge ſucceed his admiration, and he bluſhes at having been ſo intimate with men who had made him their tool to undermine that power which he was moſt jealous of preſerving.

He became the public accuſer of thoſe very Encyclopediſts who owed the greateſt part of their ſucceſs to his protection. He warned Kings, that the grand object of thoſe Sophiſters was to deliver them over to the multitude, and to teach nations

that

that ſubjects may exerciſe the right of depoſing their Sovereign when they are diſpleaſed with him *. He gives notice to the Kings of France, that their Conſpiracy is more particularly aimed at them.

The denunciation is clearly and formally expreſſed in the following terms: "*The Encyclopediſts reform all Governments.* *France* (according to their plans) *is to form a great Republic, and a Mathematician is to be its Legiſlator.* — Mathematicians will govern it, and work all the operations *of the new Republic* by fluxions. — *This Republic* is to live in perpetual peace, and ſupport itſelf without an army."

This ironic and ſarcaſtic ſtyle was by no means in Frederic's natural diſpoſition. The repute of the pretended wiſdom of the Sophiſters had given weight to the adepts, and contributed to the ſeduction of the people; and contempt was the moſt powerful weapon that could be employed againſt them. It is on this account that he repreſents theſe pretended ſages as puffed up with their own merits and their ridiculous pride. But whatever may be his ſtyle, it is to guard Kings and Nations againſt their plots that he writes. "The Encyclopediſts," ſays he, "are a ſet of pretended Philoſophers who have lately ſtarted into exiſtence. They look upon themſelves as ſuperior to

* See Refutation of the Syſtem of Nature by the King of Pruſſia.

" every ſchool which antiquity has produced. " *To the effrontery of the Cynic* they add the *impu-* " *dence* of uttering every paradox their brain can " invent. They are a ſet of *preſumptuous* men, " who never will own themſelves to be in the " wrong. According to their principles, the ſage " can never be miſtaken, he is the only en- " lightened perſon: It is from him that the light " emanates which is to diſſipate the dreary dark- " neſs into which the ſilly and blind multitude " have been deluded. And God knows how they " enlighten them. At one time it is by unfold- " ing the *origin of Prejudices*, at another, it is by " a book *on the Mind*, or a *Syſtem of Nature*; in " ſhort, there is no end to them. A ſet *of* " *puppies*, whether from faſhion or an air they " aſſume, call themſelves their diſciples. They " affect to copy them, and take upon themſelves " to be the Deputy Governors of Mankind!"

While painting in ſuch colours the pretenſions and ridiculous pride of both Maſters and Scholars, Frederic declares that *the madhouſe* would be their moſt proper habitation, *where they might legiſlate over their crazy equals*; or elſe, to ſhow the ignorance of their ſyſtems, and what innumerable diſaſters they would engender, he wiſhes " that ſome " province which deſerved a *ſevere puniſhment* " ſhould be delivered over to them. Then they " would learn, ſays he, by experience, after having

" thrown

" thrown every thing topſy turvy, that they were " a ſet of ignorant fellows; they would learn that " to criticize is eaſy, but that the art of criticiſm " is difficult; and above all, that no one is ſo apt " to *talk nonſenſe as he that meddles with what he* " *does not underſtand**."

Frederic, in ſupport of regal authority, would ſometimes lay aſide his epigrammatic ſtyle and think it incumbent on him to condeſcend to the refutation of the groſs calumnies which his Sophiſtical Maſters had invented againſt the throne. It is thus that we ſee him refuting the Syſtem of Nature and the *Eſſay on Prejudice*, which latter the ſecret academy had publiſhed under the name of Dumarſais. There he principally devotes himſelf to expoſing the cunning of the Sophiſters; he ſhows with what wicked art the Conſpirators, calumniating the Sovereigns and the Pontiffs, only ſeek to inſtigate the hatred of all nations againſt them. Among others we may diſtinguiſh the author of the Syſtem of Nature, who in an eſpecial manner has undertaken to diſparage all Sovereigns. " *I can venture to aſſert*," he ſays, " *that* " *the Clergy have never ſpoken to Princes all that* " *nonſenſe* which the author pretends. If ever " they may have repreſented Kings as the images " of the Deity, it was doubtleſs only in an hyper-

* See Refutation of the Syſtem of Nature, by the King of Pruſſia.

"bolical ſenſe, to guard them by the compariſon "againſt any abuſe of their authority, and to "warn them to be juſt and beneficent, that they "may imitate the general attributes given to the "Deity by all nations. The author has dreamed, "that treaties have been made between the Sove-"reign and the Eccleſiaſtic, in which Princes "had agreed to honour and ſanction the power "of the Clergy provided the latter preached ſub-"miſſion to the people. I will venture to affirm, "that this is a ſhallow invention, and that nothing "could be more ridiculous or void of foundation, "than the ſuppoſition of ſuch a fact *."

Though Frederic expreſſes himſelf thus on the Eccleſiaſtics, ſtill the reader is not to ſuppoſe him more favourable to their cauſe. On the contrary, his Antichriſtian prejudices blind him to ſuch a degree, that he does not ſo much blame the Sophiſters for attacking Religion, as for having done it unſkilfully; he even points out the weapons with which he wiſhes it had been aſſailed. But the more inveterate his hatred againſt Chriſtianity, the more demonſtrative are the proofs he alledges againſt thoſe from whom he had imbibed it, and of their plots againſt the throne. He pardons their attack upon the altar, he even ſupports their advances, but he defends the throne. At length

* See Refutation of the Syſtem of Nature, by the King of Pruſſia.

however

however he diſcovered and was convinced, that from the Conſpiracy againſt the Altar the Sophiſters paſſed to that againſt the Throne. It is this latter Conſpiracy which he wiſhes to lay open; and it is with theſe latter plots that he charges the whole ſchool in the perſon of Diderot, when he ſays, "The true ſentiments of the Author, on Governments, are only to be diſcovered toward the end of his work. It is there that he lays down as a principle that ſubjects ought to enjoy *the right of depoſing their Sovereigns* when diſpleaſed with them. And it is *to effectuate this* that he is perpetually crying out againſt great armies, which would prove too powerful an obſtacle to his deſigns. A perſon would be tempted to think, it was Fontaine's fable of the Wolf and the Shepherd that he was reading. If ever the viſionary ideas of our Philoſophers could be realized, it would *be neceſſary to new-mould every Government in Europe*, which would be a mere trifle. It would be neceſſary again, though perhaps impoſſible, that *ſubjects ſetting up as the judges* of their maſters ſhould be wiſe and equitable; that thoſe who aſpired to the crown* ſhould be free from ambition; and that neither intrigue, cabal, nor the ſpirit of independence ſhould prevail."

* See Refutation of the Syſtem of Nature, by the King of Pruſſia.

Nothing could have been more maſterly applied in theſe obſervations than the compariſon of the Wolf and the Shepherd. Frederic perfectly comprehended that the object of theſe declamatory repetitions of the ſect againſt the vain-glory of war, was not ſo much to inſtil the love of peace into the minds of the Sovereign, as to deprive him of the neceſſary forces to repreſs that rebellious ſpirit which Philoſophiſm ſought to infuſe into the people. He overlooked all thoſe common truths on the miſeries of war, which the Sophiſters deſcribed, as if ſolely capable of deſcribing them; but when he clearly perceived their plots, the hatred he conceived for the ſect made him dedicate his talents to counteract the Philoſophiſts in his own ſtates, and to render them elſewhere as contemptible as he judged them dangerous.

It was then, that he compoſed *thoſe Dialogues of the Dead*, between Prince Eugene, the Duke of Marlborough and the Prince of Lichtenſtein, in which he particularly developes the ignorance of the *Encyclopediſts*; their abſurd pretenſion of governing the univerſe after their own new-fangled doctrines; and, above all, their plan for aboliſhing the Monarchical form of Government, and of beginning by the ſubverſion of the throne of Bourbon to transform France into a Republic.

At that period it was in vain for Voltaire or D'Alembert to ſolicit his protection for any of the adepts.

adepts. Frederic would anſwer in *a dry and laconic ſtyle*, 'Let the ſcribblers of the ſect go and ſeek a refuge in Holland, *where they may follow the ſame trade with ſo many of their equals.*' His indignation and contempt was expreſſed in ſuch ſtrong terms, that D'Alembert often thought it neceſſary to ſoften the expreſſions in his correſpondence with Voltaire *.

Then it was that D'Alembert perceived the *great miſtake* which Philoſophiſm had committed in reuniting the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical power againſt them. It was then that Diderot and his co-operators in *the Syſtem of Nature* were nothing more that a ſet of *blunderheads*. Then it was that Frederic loſt his title of *Solomon of the North*, and D'Alembert depicts him as a *peeviſh man*, or as a ſick perſon whom the Philoſophers might accoſt as Chatillon does Nereſtan:

My Lord, if thus it is, your favour's vain.

"Beſides, he ſays, Mr. Deliſle (the adept who "was recommended and ſo ill received) might "not have been happy in the place we wiſhed to "procure for him (to attend on the King of "Pruſſia). *You know as well as I do what a* "*maſter he would have had to do with* †." As to

* Letter of D'Alembert to Voltaire, 27th December 1777.

† Letter 24th January 1778.

Voltaire,

Voltaire, who was equally in diſgrace, he conſoles himſelf by writing to D'Alembert, "What "can we do, my dear friend; we muſt take Kings "as they are and God too *."

It is worthy of remark, that neither D'Alembert nor Voltaire ſeek to deceive Frederic as to the double Conſpiracy which he attributed to their ſchool. Silence, it is to be ſuppoſed, was judged the moſt prudent; and it really was ſo for men ſenſible that Frederic might bring further proofs, which would only expoſe their plots in a clearer light, and that before they could exult in their completion.

However numerous the proofs may be that we have already adduced of the Conſpiracy againſt the Throne, whatever evidence may reſult from the wiſhes and the ſecret correſpondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, whatever may be the combination of the Syſtems adopted by the ſect, on one ſide throwing the authority of the laws into the hands of the people to conſtitute the Monarch the Slave of the multitude; on the other eraſing the very name of King from the governments of the earth; however inconteſtable the object of thoſe writings, all, or nearly all, iſſued from the ſecret academy of the Sophiſters may

* Letter, 4th January 1778.

be,

be *, all breathing hatred to Kings and annihilation to the Throne as well as to the Altar; whatever may be the force which the declarations of the penitent adepts, or of the accomplices exulting in their ſucceſſes, may add to our demonſtrations; however authentic the evidence of the public tribunals may be, denouncing to the whole univerſe the Conſpiracy of the Sophiſters againſt Monarchy: In ſhort, however aggravating the indignation and denunciations of the royal adept againſt his former maſters of impiety (reduced as he is to tear off their maſk, to preſerve his own throne) may be for the conſpiring Sophiſters,

* After ſuch a variety of proofs, and the declaration of the adept Le Roi reſpecting the hiding-place of the Sophiſters at the Hotel d'Holbach, it would be uſeleſs for us to ſeek any further teſtimonies. Nevertheleſs, we think it incumbent on us to ſay, that ſince the publication of the firſt volume we have met with ſeveral people, who without being acquainted with all the particulars that we have given, knew the chief object of that meeting to have been the contriving and forwarding of the double conſpiracy. I met with an Engliſh Gentleman in particular, who heard the academician Duſaux poſitively aſſert, that the major part of thoſe books, which have operated ſo great a change in the minds of the people with reſpect to Monarchy and Religion, had been compoſed in that club of the Hotel d'Holbach. And certainly the teſtimony of Mr. Duſaux, a man ſo intimately connected with the Sophiſtical Authors of the Revolution, is as much to be depended upon at leaſt as that of the repentant or exulting adepts of the ſect.

ſtill

ſtill theſe are only the beginning of the proofs which the Hiſtorian may hereafter collect from our Memoirs. We ſtill have many gradations of the conſpiracy to inveſtigate, and each ſtep will add new force to our demonſtrations.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Fifth Step of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.

The Democratic Eſſay at Geneva.

AT the very time when Frederic II. was denouncing this impious ſect (which he had heretofore protected with ſo much tenderneſs) as inimical to all authorities, he was far from being acquainted with the real depth of their plans. It is chiefly to Voltaire that we ſee him complain of the temerity of thoſe philoſophers againſt whom he was obliged to defend his Throne *; and that at a time when Voltaire and the other Encyclopedian adepts, more particularly the Œconomiſts, were making the firſt eſſay that ever was made of the ſyſtems of the ſect.

Government of Geneva before the Revolution of 1770.

Geneva, that town where none but a few *beggarly fellows* believed in Chriſtianity †, had been choſen for this firſt eſſay. The democracy which Calvin had eſtabliſhed in that Republic was not in uniſon with their new rights of man. They beheld the people ſubdivided into different claſſes.

* Letter to Voltaire, 7th July 1770, and Correſpondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, 1770. † 1ſt Part. Page 32.

The

The firſt claſs was that of citizens or burgeſſes, and comprehended the deſcendants of the ancient Geneveſe, or thoſe received into this claſs, and it was from among them alone, that the councils and other officers of the Republic were choſen. They particularly had their vote in the general council. Three other claſſes had been formed of thoſe who were more recently annexed to the Republic, or who had never been incorporated into the claſs of citizens. Theſe were the natives, the mere inhabitants of the town, and the ſubjects. All theſe could, under the protection of the Republic, with very few exceptions, follow their divers trades and profeſſions, acquire and cultivate lands, &c. but were excluded from the councils and principal dignities of the Republic.

However odious ſuch diſtinctions may have appeared to the Sophiſters, nevertheleſs the man who appeals to ſound judgment and real principles will eaſily agree, that a Republic, or any State enjoying Sovereignty, has a right to admit new inhabitants on certain conditions which may be juſt and oftentimes neceſſary, without eſtabliſhing on that account a perfect equality between the real and the adoptive children of the State. He who aſks to be admitted knows the conditions of his admiſſion, and the exceptions he is expoſed to. He was perfectly free to accept, to refuſe, or to ſeek an aſylum elſewhere; but certainly, having once

once accepted and admitted of theſe exceptions, he has no further right to create diſturbances in the Republic, on pretence that, all men being equal, the adoptive child is entitled to the ſame privileges as the ancient children of the State.

But ſuch ſelf-evident principles were not conſonant with thoſe of the ſect. Even Voltaire had laid them aſide. From the perpetual repetition of his Liberty and Equality applied to religion, he had adopted the ſame doctrine with reſpect to politics. At the diſtance of ſix miles he had long ſince been obſerving the feuds which had ariſen between the citizens and the magiſtrates, and thought that by working a political revolution there, he might add new laurels to thoſe which he had gained by the religious revolution in which he ſo much gloried.

Parts acted by Voltaire and the other Sophiſters.

Hitherto theſe diſputes between the magiſtrates and the citizens had been confined to the interpretation of certain laws, and of the conſtitution. The natives, and other claſſes who were excluded from the legiſlative power, were only ſpectators of the quarrel, when Voltaire and the other Sophiſters judged this a favourable moment to change the very conſtitution of the Republic, and to make an eſſay of their new Syſtems of Liberty and Equality, of the Legiſlative and Sovereign people.

All Europe is acquainted with the troubles which agitated Geneva from the year 1770 till 1782.

The

table, and to each he broached the ſentiments which he wiſhed to inſtil into them. To the citizens he would urge, that their legiſlative power abſolutely made the magiſtrates dependent on them; and he would perſuade the natives or inhabitants, that living in the ſame Republic and ſubject to the ſame laws, the equality of nature aſſimilated their rights to thoſe of citizens; that the time was come when they ſhould ceaſe to be ſlaves, or to obey laws which they had not made; that they were no longer to be victims of ſuch odious diſtinctions, or ſubject to taxes diſgraceful, inaſmuch as they were levied without their having conſented to them.

Such inſinuations acquired new vigour from the numerous pamphlets flowing from the fertile pen of the Premier Chief. Under the name of a Geneveſe he publiſhed the *Republican Ideas*, which will always bear teſtimony of his hatred for Kings, and ſhow how much ground Republican Liberty had gained in his heart as he advanced in years.

As to this hatred, he expreſſes it in the above pamphlet, by ſaying, "There never yet has "exiſted a perfect government, becauſe men are "prone to their paſſions—*The moſt tolerable, with-* "*out doubt, is the Republican, becauſe, under that* "*form, men approach the neareſt to the equality of* "*nature.* Every father of a family ſhould be "maſter in his own houſe, but is to have no "power over the houſe of his neighbour. So-

" ciety being an aggregate of many houſes, and of " many lands belonging to them, *it would be a* " contradictory propoſition to pretend that *one* " *man* ſhould have the ſole dominion over all thoſe " houſes and lands; *and it is natural, that each* " *maſter ſhould have his vote for the general welfare* " *of ſociety* *."

This article alone was ſufficient to incite the Geneveſe to revolt, particularly the natives and others who had acquired lands under the dominion of the Republic. He told them, that to deprive them of the right of voting was to rob them of a natural right inherent to them. But to expreſs himſelf in ſtill clearer terms, the true diſciple of Monteſquieu and Jean Jaques, he repeats their fundamental tenets; he tells the Geneveſe, " that civil " government *is the will of* ALL, executed by *one* " or *many*, by virtue of *laws which* ALL *have en-* " *acted* †." With reſpect to finance, it is well known, that it is the right of the citizens to regulate and determine what is to be granted for the expences of the State ‡.

It

* Republican Ideas, No. 43. Edit. of Kell.

† Ibid. No. 13.

‡ Ibid. No. 42. Many people cannot conceive that Voltaire could have fallen into ſuch Democracy. Let them read his latter works with attention, and particularly thoſe from which we have made the above extracts, and they will find that he is even violent againſt the diſtinction of *Noble*

(he

It was not poſſible to tell all thoſe, who lived under the Geneveſe dominion without having voted at the enacting of the laws, or at the impoſition of the taxes, that they were bound by no tie under

(he who holds lands by knights ſervices) and *Roturier* (who holds lands in ſoccage). He even declares the origin and real ſignification of theſe two words to be no other than Lord and Slave.

Let them read *his Commentary on the Spirit of Laws*, and they will ſee in what a light he viewed that nobility, among whom he nevertheleſs numbered ſo many admirers, and to whom he was ſo much indebted for the propagation of his Philoſophiſm. Is it not hatred which makes him ſay in this Commentary, "I "could wiſh that the author (Monteſquieu), or any other "writer poſſeſſing ſuch abilities, had explained more clearly "why *the nobility* are eſſential to the Monarchical form of "government. One ſhould rather be tempted to believe, that "it was the eſſence of the Feudal Syſtem, as in Germany, or "of Ariſtocracy as at Venice." (No. 111.)

To us it appears, that, whether young or old, Voltaire often confounds all his ideas. The idea of nobility, in general, repreſents to us the children of men diſtinguiſhed by their ſervices either civil or military, forming a body in the ſtate whoſe ſentiments and education, whoſe very intereſt, often fits them for thoſe employments which are at the diſpoſal of the Sovereign. Undoubtedly ſuch a diſtinction may take place without the Feudal Syſtems of the Germans, or the Ariſtocracy of the Venetians. It is poſſible indeed to conceive a Monarchy without a body of nobility; but moſt certainly ſuch a diſtinction greatly tends to form a body of men more attached to the Monarch, and very uſeful to the State in thoſe ſtations for which the general education of the multitude can ſeldom be a ſuitable preparative.

their preſent government, and that no government could exiſt for them until the ancient conſtitution was overthrown. Let the reader judge what an impreſſion ſuch writings muſt have made, profuſely ſpread about, and diſtributed with that art which we have ſeen Voltaire deſcribing, when he wiſhed to infuſe his venomous doctrines into the loweſt claſſes of the people.

But means ſtill more perfidious were made uſe of. The Sophiſters have been ſeen extolling the generoſity of their Premier; and, as a proof, they cite the multitude of Geneveſe artizans who taking refuge at Ferney found a new country and protection in Voltaire's little province, and partook ſufficiently of his riches to continue their trades and ſupport their families. But when we interrogate thoſe who on the ſpot could obſerve the ſecret motives of ſuch a perfidious generoſity, we hear them anſwer, "Voltaire, it is true, has been in ſome ſort the founder of Ferney, of a new town; but they will add, how did he people it, if it was not with thoſe factious citizens whom he had ſtirred up againſt their country, and which he reünites at Ferney and Verſoi to form a focus of inſurrection, which was to force the unhappy Republic, by the deſertion of its natives and inhabitants, to receive the law from the Sophiſters, and to ſubſtitute their ſyſtems to the ancient laws of the Republic?"

Notwith-

Notwithſtanding all theſe means and intrigues, the levelling ſect had other agents who forwarded the revolution at Geneva. It had already acquired that Claviére, who was hereafter to continue his revolutionary career at Paris; it had acquired a ſort of petty Syeyes in the perſon of Berenger, and a true firebrand in Segère; but above all it gloried in ſeeing a French magiſtrate leaving his country, and laying aſide the comely habit of the bench for the filthy round head of the Jacobin. This was Mr. de Servan, that Attorney-General of Grenoble, whom Voltaire in his correſpondence with D'Alembert repreſents as one of the *greateſt proficients* in modern philoſophy, and as one of thoſe who had chiefly *forwarded its progreſs*. It is remarkable, that this letter bears date the 5th of November 1770, the very year of the Geneveſe Revolution. Like a true apoſtle of Liberty and Equality, Mr. Servan had hurried away to Geneva to unite his efforts to thoſe of Voltaire. But Philoſophiſm had not confined its ſuccours to his talents and reputation alone. An attorney of the name of Bovier of the ſame parliament, powerfully aided it with his pen. He appeared with all the arms of Sophiſtry. Whilſt the other adepts were ſtirring up, in their clubs and private companies, the citizen againſt the magiſtrate, and the native and inhabitant againſt the citizen, Bovier, to raiſe his conſtitution of Equality from the midſt of

Meſſ. Servan and Bovier.

diſcord and civil broils, pretends to aſſert the real rights of the ancient conſtitution, not to form a new one; and from antiquity alone he appears to draw all his arguments in favor of the Equality and Sovereignty of the People.

The moſt revolutionary among the Geneveſe were ſurprized to ſee a foreign Sophiſter informing them, that till then they had been ignorant of their own laws; that all thoſe diſtinctions of citizens, inhabitants, or natives, and all the privileges of the firſt, were novelties which had been uſurped and introduced into the Republic ſo lately as the year 1707; that before that period a very ſhort reſidence entitled every new comer "to the rights "of citizen, and to be admitted into the general "*ſovereign and legiſlative* council. That after one "year's reſidence at Geneva, every man enjoyed "his ſhare of Sovereignty in the Republic; in "ſhort, that the moſt perfect equality had reigned "among all the individuals of the State, whether "of the town or country *."

This was nearly the ſame plan which the ſect followed at that time in France, always calling for the States-General in order to re-eſtabliſh the pretended conſtitution of the Sovereign and Legiſlative people. Bovier was refuted in the moſt complete manner, but the Sophiſters knew too well

* See the Memorial of Bovier from page 15 to 29; and the refutation of the natives of Geneva.

that

that a people in a ſtate of revolution ſwallow every falſehood that favors their Sovereignty. They ſucceeded in putting them in motion, nor were they ignorant of the means of accelerating and perpetuating their vibrations.

Parts acted by the Œconomiſts, and particularly by Dupont de Nemours.

At that time they publiſhed at Paris a periodical work under the title of *Ephémérides du Citoyen*. The Œconomiſts had the direction of it, and that claſs of adepts was perhaps the moſt dangerous. They, with all the appearance of moderation, with all the ſhow of patriotic zeal, forwarded the revolution more efficaciouſly than the frantic rebels of Holbach's Club. The ſect had ordained that this journal ſhould ſupport the efforts of Voltaire, Servan, and Bovier, until they had ſucceeded in their democratic eſſay on Geneva. It was the hypocritical and ſmooth-tongued Dupont de Nemours, who was entruſted with the care of giving monthly a new ſhock to the Revolutioniſts. His periodical publications, carefully directed towards that object, were regularly ſent from Paris to Geneva to ſecond the fury of the Democratizing Zealots.

To form a proper judgment of the artful manner in which Dupont fulfilled his truſt, it would be neceſſary to run over all the articles which the *Ephemerous Citizen* has given us under the head *of Geneva*. There we ſhould ſee the humane citizen lamenting the troubles which had already ſhortened

the lives of ſome natives, and had baniſhed many others from their country; then, fired by that love of peace and humanity which conſumes the philoſophic breaſt, he inſinuates exactly ſuch remedies as may throw the whole Republic into a flame. He repreſents their conſtitution as that of the moſt oppreſſive *Ariſtocracy*. He aſſimilates the natives and inhabitants of Geneva to the *Helots* or the ſlaves of Greece, who, under the dominion of free citizens, have nothing but the moſt abject ſlavery to look up to in the very heart of a Republic *. Then for the inſtruction of the Geneveſe *Helots* he lays down what he calls principles, or rather leſſons of rebellion; ſuch for example as theſe given to a people in the moſt violent ferment. "To ſay that men can tacitly or formally conſent for themſelves or their deſcendants to the privation of the *whole* or *part* of their liberty, would be to ſay, that men have the right to ſtipulate againſt the rights of other men, to ſell and cede what belongs to others, to alienate their happineſs, and perhaps deſtroy their very lives:—and of what others? of thoſe whoſe happineſs and whoſe lives ſhould be the moſt ſacred to them,—of their poſterity. Such a doctrine would be a libel on the dignity of human nature, and an inſult to its Great Creator †."

* Ibid. Chap. 1. and Note. † Ibid. Chap. 2.

This

This certainly was inſulting both reaſon and ſociety in the groſſeſt terms; for if every man who ſubjects himſelf to the empire of civil laws does not ſacrifice a part of his liberty, he is then as free to violate thoſe laws, though living in ſociety, as he would be were he living among the ſavages in the woods of America. But it was through pity and humanity that they fed this people, in open revolution, with the moſt frantic licentiouſneſs. It was to ſpare the effuſion of blood in Geneva that Dupont taught the multitude of *natives*, *inhabitants*, and *burgeſſes*, to ſay to the ſenators, "Do you imagine the exerciſe of Sovereignty to "be ſufficient, as if the proper exerciſe of it were "not an obligation. Do you know that when "the people have once *recognized* your authority, "you are imperatively and ſtrictly obliged, under "pain of the moſt deſerved execration, to render "them happy, to protect their liberty, to guarantee and defend their rights of property to the "utmoſt extent. Republicans, if you wiſh your "fellow-citizens to exerciſe Sovereignty, remember that even Kings only enjoy their power on "theſe terms.

"Would you wiſh to be worſe Sovereigns than "the arbitrary Deſpots of Aſia? And when even "thoſe who reign over nations buried in ignorance "and fanaticiſm abuſe their monſtrous power to a "certain exceſs ..... They are called tyrants.

"Do

" Do you know what happens to them? Go to " the gates of the ſeraglios of the Eaſt, *behold the* " *people calling for the* HEADS *of the Viſirs and* " *Athemadoulets*; and ſometimes ſtriking off thoſe " of the Sultans and Sophis. Now reign arbitra- " rily if you dare. Yes, dare it in your town, " where the people are far from being ignorant, " and, brought up with you from your childhood, " have had many occaſions, ſetting aſide your " dignity, to know that you are no better than " they *."

Thus we ſee that our moderate and humane Sophiſters would not loſe an occaſion, any more than Raynal, or Holbach's Club, of teaching the people to roar rather than to groan, and to wade through carnage preceded by terror to the conqueſt of their pretended rights.

Such leſſons were intermixed with thoſe which the Œconomiſts pretended to give to Sovereigns on the adminiſtration of finances. " One ſaw " them, ſay the memoirs of the man who follow- " ed their operations with the greateſt accuracy " during the whole of this Revolution,—one ſaw " them inſinuating themſelves into all the affairs " of the State, to ſeize every opportunity of in- " fuſing the doctrines of the ſect. Amidſt their " leſſons on œconomy, that on the razing our for-

* Ibid. Chap. 2.

" tifications

" tifications is not to be forgotten; their pretence
" was the great expence and little utility of them.
" Geneva, they would ſay, cannot be conſidered
" as a ſtate capable of defending a fortreſs ſhould
" it be at war with any of the neighbouring States;
" and with reſpect to a ſurprize, it is the inhabitants
" of the country that are to prove its defence *:
" A moſt abſurd propoſition for a State about a
" league ſquare. But that was not their object;
" they wiſhed to eſtabliſh the general principle,
" and to apply it hereafter to France, or any
" other State, when the opportunity ſhould offer."
In other words, it was the means of expoſing the Sovereign to all the fury of a revolted people reclaiming by force of arms that Liberty and Equality which the Sophiſters were perpetually repreſenting to them as their inherent rights. This alſo was the object of thoſe perfidious leſſons which they pretended to give to the magiſtrates, repreſenting them as oppreſſors, and preſuppoſing the exiſtence of that hatred againſt them which the adepts themſelves had infuſed into the minds of the people. With the ſame art they thus again addreſſed us, ſays our obſerver: " The natural
" defenders of Geneva are the people of the coun-
" try, the ſubjects of the Republic. It is poſſi-
" ble, nay, it is eaſy, to attach them ſo much to

* Ephem. du Citoyen, 1771. Vol. I.

" the

" the Republic, that they would form the moſt ſe-
" cure advanced poſts poſſible. But it would be
" neceſſary that their country ſhould be far other-
" wiſe than a *harſh, ſevere, and exacting maſter*;
" it would be neceſſary to reſtore them to the
" free exerciſe of the natural rights of man, and to
" guarantee their poſſeſſion *."

The ſect reaped a twofold advantage from this journal. Firſt, by ſpreading it through France, and preparing the multitude to hold at a future day a ſimilar language to their Kings; ſecondly, to kindle anew the flame of diſcord at the beginning of every month among the unfortunate people of Geneva, for whom it appeared to be written. The brotherhood at Paris continued this work until Servan, and the other agents of the ſect, had ſeen their plots effectuate a Revolution in Geneva, and a total overthrow of the ancient laws of that Republic.

* Ephem. du Citoyen, page 176. I have ſought in vain to learn what ſpecies of oppreſſion the people of Geneva ſuffered under their magiſtrates; I have found that it was not poſſible for a people to be more fondly or more juſtly attached to their government; that the union between the magiſtrates and the ſubjects reſembled that of a numerous family with its Chiefs. The Sophiſters knew this too well; but they were not ſpeaking for the Geneveſe alone. They pre-ſuppoſed diſcord, that they might create it where it did not exiſt, and add to it where it already began to ſpread.

It

It is true, the Sophiſters did not long enjoy their ſucceſs, as Mr. de Vergennes, who at firſt had viewed this Revolution with indifference, ſoon learned its importance. Evidence at length convinced him that all that had come to paſs at Geneva was nothing more than an eſſay which our modern Sophiſters were making of their principles and ſyſtems; that neither their plans nor their plots were to be concluded by theſe firſt ſucceſſes; that they were nothing more than a prelude to the revolutionary ſcenes with which they threatened all Europe, and which might ere long involve France itſelf in the common maſs of ruin.

The Sophiſters had the mortification to ſee theſe firſt fruits of their revolutionary principles blaſted by a few battalions of French troops. It was reſerved to Clavierre, and afterwards to Robeſpierre, to reſume their plans, and to ſend the apoſtate Soulavie to conſummate them by murder and exile, in ſhort by all the revolutionary means which Philoſophiſm had invented in the Caſtle of Ferney for the future benefit of the Jacobinical den *.

* The above Chapter, whether with reſpect to the general conduct of the Sophiſters, or more particularly with reſpect to the conduct of Voltaire, Servan, or Dupont de Nemours, during the Revolution of Geneva, has been entirely formed on memoirs with which eye-witneſſes have favored us, and on the writings of the Sophiſters, which have been quoted with the greateſt preciſion.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Ariſtocratical Eſſay in France.

Object of this eſſay.

IN laying before the reader the proofs of the Conſpiracy formed againſt Monarchy we have ſaid, that there exiſted a ſet of Philoſophers who held themſelves ſo ſecure of bringing about a Revolution, that they had not ſcrupled to adviſe both the King and his Miniſters to make the Revolution themſelves, leſt Philoſophy might not be ſufficiently powerful to direct the motion when once imparted. Among this claſs of Philoſophers, who wiſhed to be ſtyled the *Moderates*, but whom Jean Jaques calls the *Inconſiſtents*, we are to diſtinguiſh Mr. de Mably, the brother of Condillac, and one of thoſe Abbés who bore nothing of the Eccleſiaſtic but the dreſs, and who, beſtowing great application on prophane ſciences, was almoſt entirely ignorant of thoſe neceſſary for an Eccleſiaſtic.

Mably and his errors, and his adherents.

Without being impious like a Voltaire or a Condorcet, even though adverſe to their impiety, his own tenets were extremely equivocal. At times his morality was ſo very diſguſting, that it was neceſſary to ſuppoſe that his language was ambiguous, and that he had been miſunderſtood, let

leſt one ſhould be obliged to throw off all eſteem for his character. At leaſt ſuch has been the defence I have heard him make to juſtify himſelf from the cenſures of the Sorbonne. He had the higheſt opinion of his own knowledge in politics, and during his whole life that was his favourite topic; he believed himſelf tranſcendant in that ſcience, and he met with others who were led to the ſame belief. His *mediocre* talents would have been better appreciated, had he been viewed in the light of a man led away by the prejudices he had imbibed from a ſcanty knowledge of antiquity, and who wiſhed to reduce every thing to the ſtandard of his own ideas.

Mr. de Mably had alſo been led away by all thoſe Syſtems of Liberty, of the Sovereignty and Legiſlative authority of the people, of the rights of ſelf-taxation and of contributing to the public expences only in as much as they had voted the monies themſelves or by their repreſentatives.—He was perſuaded that he had found theſe Syſtems of Government among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and more particularly among the ancient Gauls. He was perfectly perſuaded, that without the States General the French Monarchy could not exiſt; and that to re-eſtabliſh the ancient and real Conſtitution, it was neceſſary to reſume thoſe States General *.

* See his Rights of the Citizen.

Mably

Mably and his diſciples, or more properly the adherents of Monteſquieu, deteſted the feudal laws; but they did not reflect that it was to thoſe very laws the States-General owed their former exiſtence. When Philip Le Bel and ſome other Princes had found themſelves under the neceſſity of applying to thoſe States for ſubſidies, the reaſon was, becauſe under the feudal ſyſtem the King, like the Counts of Provence, Champagne, and Thouloufe, or the Dukes of Brittany, had their fixed revenues and particular deſmenes which were ſuppoſed to ſuffice for the exigencies of the ſtate. And in fact wars of the longeſt duration could be carried on without its being neceſſary to augment the revenues of the Sovereign. Armies at that time were compoſed of the Lords and Knights ſerving at their own expence and defraying that of their vaſſals whom they led after them into the field. Neither Mably nor his diſciples would reflect that at a period when France had acquired ſo many new Provinces, when the armies, general officers, and ſoldiers, waged war ſolely at the King's expence, it was impoſſible for the ancient crown lands to ſupply the wants of Government. They could not conceive, that in the new ſyſtem of politics, it would have been the height of imprudence for the Monarch in France to be dependent (every time he found it neceſſary to repel or anticipate an attack of the foreign enemy) on

on the great and jealous Lord, on the ſeditious tribune, or on the ſurly deputy, perhaps even in the intereſt of the enemy, for the neceſſary ſubſidies on ſo preſſing an occaſion. Such reflections as theſe never occurred to the minds of our Sophiſters.

At what period, and why they call for the States General.

Filled with the idea, that Revolution and the States General were neceſſary to break the chains of the French people, we are told by his ſtrongeſt adherents, that Mably went ſtill farther than merely inviting the Sovereign and his Miniſters to commence the Revolution themſelves: "He upbraided the people in his Treatiſe *on the Rights of Citizens*, written *in the year* 1771, with having miſſed the opportunity of making the Revolution; and he lays down the means of effecting it. He adviſed the Parliament in future to refuſe to enregiſter any burſal edict, to declare to the King that he had no right to impoſe taxes on the people, who alone were veſted with the fiſcal power, *to aſk pardon of the people* for having co-operated during ſo long a time in the levy of ſuch unjuſt taxes, and to ſupplicate his Majeſty to convoke the States General. *A Revolution*, he adds, brought about by ſuch means would be the more advantageous as it would be founded on the love of

" order and of the laws, and not on licentious " liberty *."

This ſyſtem of a Revolution to be accompliſhed, according to Monteſquieu's ideas, by veſting the legiſlative and fiſcal powers in the hands of the people, or of their repreſentatives in the States General, found many ſupporters and abettors; and particularly among the Ariſtocracy, as the diſtinction of the three ſtates was ſtill preſerved. All that claſs of men which impiety had enrolled under the banners of Sophiſtry from among the Duke de la Rochefoucault's ſociety, viewed this as a means for the Grandees to reaſſume their ancient influence in the ſtate, and to conquer from the King and Court, that power which they had gradually loſt under the preceding reigns. They were ignorant that other Sophiſters were already prepared to enforce their ſyſtems of Equality in thoſe States General, and to aſſert, that *the three eſtates being ſeparate, of oppoſite intereſts, and jealous of each other, mutually deſtroyed each other's ſtrength; and that to this diſtinction was to be attributed the inefficacy, and the very little good that had ariſen from all the former States General.* The Grandees did not perceive this ſnare which the levelling Sophiſters had laid for them; the levellers had conceived

* Gudin's Supplement to the Social Contract, 3d Part, Chap. 1.

the

the greateſt expectations from the diſſentions which reigned at that period between Lewis XV. and the Parliaments, and believed themſelves on the eve of obtaining the convocation of thoſe States General where they were to conſummate their revolution.

Theſe diſſentions were principally owing to an opinion originating in Monteſquieu's ſyſtems, which had crept into the firſt tribunals of the ſtate. Such magiſtrates as, according to that ſyſtem, believed Liberty to be entirely annulled in every ſtate where the people or its repreſentatives did not partake of the legiſlative and fiſcal powers with the King, had conſtrued their Parliaments into the repreſentatives of the people, and pretended that the different Parliaments, though diſperſed in different towns throughout the ſtate, conſtituted but one and the ſame body, holding their powers directly from the people, whoſe perpetual repreſentatives they pretended to be, whoſe rights they were to ſupport againſt the encroachments of the crown, and exerciſing for them that inalienable and indefeaſable right of making laws and voting ſubſidies; although they were reſident magiſtrates and fixed in different towns by the King to adminiſter juſtice in his name.

This was a ſyſtem of Parliaments very widely different from the idea which the French Kings, who had created them without even taking the

ſenſe of the nation, had conceived of theſe Judiciary Courts. It was indeed extraordinary, that tribunals either ambulant or ſtationary, and which the Kings had created at their own will and pleaſure, ſhould belong to the very eſſence of the Conſtitution; that a body of Magiſtrates all named by the King ſhould pretend to be the free choſen repreſentatives of the people, and a magiſtracy ſo much at the diſpoſition of the Sovereigns, that they had ſold the offices; could then theſe men pretend to aſſimulate themſelves to repreſentatives deputed by the people to the States General *.

* The denomination of *Parlement* (Parliament), which had been given to the firſt Tribunals of the ſtate, had greatly contributed to the illuſion, which might have been eaſily avoided had the old term of *Plaid (court leet)* been preſerved, which in the ancient hiſtory of France denotes ſometimes thoſe great aſſemblies which the King deliberated with on important queſtions reſpecting the ſtate, at other times thoſe ambulatory tribunals which adminiſtered juſtice. It was theſe latter only that our Kings had perpetuated under the name of Parliaments. The difference is the more evident, as thoſe great Aſſemblies or States General never meddled with the Judiciary Power, the exerciſe of which conſtituted the ſole functions of the ambulant Magiſtracy. In thoſe great Aſſemblies or *National Plaids* the Clergy was always admitted as the firſt order of the ſtate; whereas by the very nature of its duties, it was excluded from the *Judiciary Plaids* (ſee the Preſident Hainault, an. 1137, 1319, & *paſſim)*; how then was it poſſible to confound the States General with the Judiciary Plaids or Parliaments?

The

The ſtates themſelves never viewed the Parliaments in any other light, which is eaſy to be ſeen by what the Preſident Hainault ſays on the ſtates held in 1614: "On this occaſion I muſt ſay, "that as we recognize no other authority in "France but that of the King, it is by his au- "thority that laws are made. *As wills the King "ſo wills the Law.* On that account the States "General can only remonſtrate and humbly ſup- "plicate. The King hearkens to their grievances "and prayers in his prudence and his juſtice.— "For, was he obliged to grant all that was aſked "of him, ſays one of our moſt celebrated authors, "he would ceaſe to be their King. *It is for that "reaſon that during the ſittings of the States General "the authority of the Parliament ſuffers no dimi- "nution,* as exerciſing no other power but that "of the King, which may be eaſily ſeen in the "minutes of the laſt ſtates*."

It was therefore a moſt extraordinary claim of theſe Parliaments, all created by, and exerciſing the authority of the King only, to pretend to be the repreſentatives of the people in order to reſiſt the power of that ſame King; ſtyling themſelves the habitual and permanent repreſentatives of the States General, who had never formed the leaſt idea of ſuch repreſenta-

* Hiſtory of France, anno 1614.

tives, and who had always looked upon them as the King's Magiſtrates. But when new ſyſtems had ſpread diſquietude in every breaſt, and produced the thirſt of Revolution, illuſion eaſily baniſhed truth. The moſt reſpectable Magiſtrates, overpowered by the weight of Monteſquieu's authority, and ſpurred on by the Sophiſters, were eaſily perſuaded that every country was enſlaved, and groaned under the moſt ſevere deſpotiſm, where the legiſlative and fiſcal powers were not in the hands of the people or of their repreſentatives. And, leſt the whole code of laws which the Kings had made and the Parliaments proclaimed, ſhould ſuddenly become null and void, theſe Magiſtrates, who had enregiſtered and proclaimed them, conſtituted themſelves the repreſentatives of the people.

Theſe claims ſerved as a pretence for the moſt invincible reſiſtance to the orders of their Sovereign. The King's council, and particularly Mr. de Maupou, ſurmiſed a coalition aiming at nothing leſs than to diſorder the Monarchy, to diminiſh the authority of the throne, to put the Sovereign under the habitual dependence of the Twelve Parliaments, and to create diſturbances and diſputes between the King and his Tribunals as often as any factious Magiſtrate, aſſuming the character of a tribune of the people, ſhould oppoſe the pretended will of the nation to his Sovereign. Lewis XV. reſolved

reſolved to annihilate ſuch Parliaments, and to create new ones more limited in their powers, and which might be reſtrained within the bounds of their duty with greater eaſe.

This reſolve was being put in execution, and the Sophiſters rejoiced to ſee the diſputes daily increaſe. Convinced that theſe diſſentions would neceſſarily oblige the King to aſſemble the States General, where they ſhould be able to find means of publiſhing their plans and of operating, at leaſt in part, the Revolution they ſo ardently wiſhed for, they brought forward that ſame Maleſherbes, whom we have ſeen ſo active in ſeconding the Sophiſters of Impiety. He was at that time Preſident of the *Cour des Aides*, the firſt tribunal in Paris after the Parliament. He engaged his *company* to make the firſt ſignal ſtep towards oppoſing the States General to the authority of the Monarch. He formed thoſe remonſtrances ſince ſo famous among the Philoſophers, becauſe, under the cloak of a few reſpectful expreſſions, he had broached all the new principles of the ſect and all their pretenſions againſt the authority of their Sovereign.

Maleſherbes and the Parliaments aſk for the States General.

In thoſe remonſtrances we ſee the demand for the States-General couched in the following terms; "Until this period at leaſt the reclamations of the "Courts ſupplied, though imperfectly, the want "of the States-General; for, notwithſtanding our "zeal, we cannot pretend to ſay, that we have

" been able to make amends to the nation for the " great advantages which muſt have accrued to it, " by the intercourſe between its repreſentatives " and the Sovereign. *But at preſent the ſole re-* " *ſource* which had been left to the people is torn " from them. By whom ſhall their intereſts be " aſſerted againſt the miniſter? The people " diſperſed have no common organ by which " they may prefer their complaints. *Sire, inter-* " *rogate then the nation itſelf*, ſince that alone re- " mains to which your Majeſty can hearken *."

The other parliaments who followed Maleſherbes's example were ignorant of the intentions of the ſect which had prompted him to act. They abandoned themſelves to the torrent, and were hurried away by the impulſe given by the Sophiſters and by the public opinion, which the ſyſtem of Monteſquieu on the Legiſlative and Fiſcal Powers had new-modelled.

Miſled by Maleſherbes's example, the Parliament of Rouen alſo aſked for the States-General in their remonſtrances of the 19th March 1771, " Sire, Since the efforts of the Magiſtracy are " fruitleſs, deign to conſult the Nation aſſembled." But the former colleagues of Monteſquieu, the Parliament of Bourdeaux thought it incumbent on them to ſhow more than ordinary zeal for his principles, as is to be ſeen by the preſſing ſtyle in

* Remonſtrance of the Cour des Aides, Feb. 28, 1771.

which

which their remonſtrances of the 25th February 1771, are couched.

" If it be true (ſay theſe Magiſtrates), that the " Parliament, become ſedentary under Philip le " Bel, and perpetual under Charles VI. is not the " ſame as the Ambulant Parliament convoked " during the firſt years of Philip le Bel's reign, " under Lewis IX. under Lewis VIII. and under " Philip Auguſtus; the ſame as the *Placita* con- " voked under *Charlemagne and his deſcendants*; " the ſame as thoſe ancient aſſemblies of the " Francs of which hiſtory has preſerved the me- " mory both before and after the conqueſt; if " the diſtribution of this Parliament to different " diſtricts has changed the *eſſence of its Conſtitution*, " in ſhort, Sire, though your Courts of Parlia- " ment ſhould not have the right of examining " and verifying the new laws which your Majeſty " may pleaſe to propoſe, *ſtill the nation cannot be* " *deprived of that right, it is a right that cannot be* " *loſt; it is inalienable. To attack that right is not* " *only to betray the Nation but the King himſelf.* It " would be to overthrow the conſtitution of the " kingdom. It would be to attack the authority " of the Monarch in its very principles. Will it " be believed, that the verification of the new " laws being made by your Courts in Parliament " *does not compenſate for this primitive right of the* " *nation?* Can public order be benefited by this

" power

" power being once more exerciſed by the nation?
" Should his Majeſty deign to re-eſtabliſh the
" people in their rights, he would ſee us no longer
" claiming that portion of *authority* which the
" Kings, your predeceſſors, have entruſted us
" with, as ſoon as the nation aſſembled ſhall ex-
" erciſe that power itſelf."

It is thus that the Parliaments, a prey to a faction with whoſe dark deſigns they were wholly unacquainted, were craving pardon as it were of the people for having forgotten their inherent and inalienable rights of Legiſlation and of Sovereignty, at leaſt in part, in the Aſſembly of the States-General. They did not foreſee that a day would come when they would have to aſk pardon of the people for having called for thoſe ſame States-General, ſo fatal to the King, to themſelves and to the nation.

How this demand prepared the way for the Revolution.

The Revolution would have been accompliſhed at that time had Lewis XV. ſhown leſs reſolution. It was preciſely at that period when the ſect, painted in ſuch true colors a few months before by the Attorney General of the Parliament of Paris, " *was ſeeking to excite the people to revolt under pre-*
" *tence of enlightening them*; when its diſquiet and
" daring genius, inimical to all dependence, aſ-
" pired at the overthrow of every political con-
" ſtitution, and whoſe views would only be ac-
" compliſhed when they had ſucceeded in throw-
" ing

" ing the legiſlative and executive powers into the " hands of the multitude, *when the Majeſty of* " *Kings had been reviled, and their authority had* " *been rendered precarious and ſubordinate to the ca-* " *pricious ſtarts of an ignorant mob.*"

It was at that period " when the numbers of " the proſelytes were increaſing and the maxims " of the ſect were ſpreading far and wide, when " kingdoms felt themſelves ſhaken in their foun- " dations; when nations, aſtoniſhed, aſked each " other, whence aroſe the extraordinary changes " which had been operated among them ?" In a word, it was at that period when Mably and his diſciples were conjuring a Revolution, when the Œconomiſts were circulating and infuſing their principles into every claſs of the people, when the Philoſophers *foreſaw the Revolution, foretold it*, and propoſed *the manner of accompliſhing it by means of a combination with the people* *.

From that period the convocation of the States-General muſt have infallibly brought about the Revolution. The Sophiſters needed no longer to inſpire the Magiſtracy with their ſyſtems. The principles were admitted, though the application of them might vary. The right of verifying and examining the laws had been recognized as *a primitive and inalienable* right inherent to the people.

* See Gudin, Suppl. to the Social Contract.

If the parliament in the days of its illuſion only held this language to their Sovereign to aſſert their authority againſt his Miniſters, ſtill the Sophiſters wiſhed for no further declarations, *to revile the Majeſty of Kings, and to render their authority precarious and ſubordinate to the capricious ſtarts of an ignorant mob.* From the right of examining to the right of rejecting, or to the right of inſurrection, in ſhort, to all the rights of the Revolutionary Code, there was but one ſtep further; and the Sophiſters at the head of the multitude were ready prepared to bear down every oppoſition to that meaſure. Almoſt every exiſting law was null, becauſe it had been made by the King without conſulting the people; and all laws might be ſet aſide, becauſe the people had a right to examine them anew and hence proſcribe them, if ſuch was their will and pleaſure.

Of thoſe who ſeconded the Revolution.

Such a one, nevertheleſs, was to be a moderate Revolution in the language of the Sophiſters. It was not only thoſe Magiſtrates who, wreſting from the Sovereign his rights and transferring them to the people, and hoping by that means to enjoy the whole power in their aſſemblies, were the abettors of this Revolution; but alſo that numerous claſs of the Ariſtocracy, whom we ſhall ſee hereafter carrying to the States-General all thoſe ſyſtems of the legiſlative people; of a people preſerving all the hierarchy of birth in their

their legiſlative aſſemblies; of a people adopting Monteſquieu's principles only in as far as they applied to, and threw the power into the hands of the Ariſtocracy; in fine, this revolution was forwarded and ſupported by all that claſs of Sophiſters who, contented with having aſſerted the principles of the *Legiſlative and Sovereign people*, were pleaſed to continue the name of King to the firſt miniſter of that people.

It is averted by Lewis XV.

Lewis XV. was perfectly aware that he was on the eve of loſing the moſt precious rights of his crown. Naturally humane, and an enemy to all acts of authority, he was nevertheleſs determined to tranſmit whole and unimpaired to his ſucceſſor the power which he had received on aſcending the throne. He wiſhed to die as he had lived, a King; He diſſolved the Parliaments, refuſed to convoke the States-General, and never permitted them even to be mentioned during the remainder of his reign. But he knew that in repreſſing the Magiſtrates he had not cruſhed the monſter of Revolution. He more than once expreſſed his fears for the young Prince heir to his throne. He was even ſo much convinced that the Sophiſters would make the moſt violent efforts againſt his ſucceſſors, that he would ſay with a tone of diſquietude, *I ſhould like to know how Berri will get over all this*; meaning his grandſon, afterwards Lewis XVI. who bore the name of Berri during the life

life-time of his father, who died Dauphin. Lewis XV. however found means to ſtop the Revolution which menaced France during his life-time. The conſpirators perceived it neceſſary to defer their plans. They were content with preparing the people for its execution. In the mean time the ſect made other eſſays of a different nature, which ſhall not be loſt to Hiſtory.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Eſſay of the Sophiſters againſt Ariſtocracy.

THE diſtinctions of King and Subject, of the Sovereign making and the Multitude obeying the law, were not the only points which militated againſt the principles of a ſchool that recognized no other, whether religious or political, than *Liberty and Equality*. In all civil ſocieties there exiſt men elevated above the horizontal plane of the multitude, men who are to be diſtinguiſhed by their rank, by their titles, or by the privileges granted to their birth, to their own ſervices, or to thoſe of their anceſtors; men who, by the induſtry of their forefathers, or by their own, have acquired riches and abundance, of which their fellow-citizens cannot partake; in fine, men who earn their bread by the ſweat of their brow, while others enjoy the benefit of their labours in conſideration of a ſalary which they pay them. If the diſtinctions of nobleman and commoner be not every where known, thoſe of poor and rich are univerſally underſtood.

Philoſophiſm re-kindles the hatred againſt the nobles and the wealthy in Germany.

What-

Whatever intereſt the numberleſs adepts in the higher claſſes might have had not to puſh too far the conſequences of that Equality which they had applied to their God, there were many adepts in the lower claſſes who did not partake of any ſuch reſtraint. Many of theſe latter were to be found in France, but a much greater number in Germany and Poland, and in many other parts of Europe, where the principles of our modern Sophiſters had gained admittance.

As early as the year 1766, we have ſeen Frederic writing to Voltaire, "*That Philoſophy was* "*beginning to penetrate even into ſuperſtitious Bohe-* "*mia, and into Auſtria, the ancient abode of ſuperſti-* "*tion.*" And it is to that year that we are able to trace the firſt ſeeds of a plan which was to gratify the Sophiſters with a new Republic in thoſe countries, where the diſtinctions of Marquis or Clown, of Noble or Burgeſs, of rich or poor, were to vaniſh from before their ſight.

Conſpiracy of the Auſtrian and Bohemian Sophiſters againſt the Nobility.

The whole of what we are about to relate concerning this plan, and the various eſſays made by Philoſophiſm to extend its branches to Auſtria and Bohemia, even to Hungary and Tranſilvania, will be extracted from two Memorials, with which we have been favoured by perſons who, being on the ſpot, were enabled to obſerve with the greateſt preciſion the one the cauſes, the other the effects, which enabled the German Sophiſters to glory

glory in having preceded our Carmagnols and Septembrizing butchers in their Revolutionary depredations.

Scarcely had the French Philoſophiſm penetrated to the banks of the Moldaw, when thoſe baneful principles of *Liberty and Equality* which formerly had led the Huſſites and Thaborites to the enthuſiaſtic murder of the Clergy and Nobility, to the laying in aſhes the Caſtles and Monaſteries, were ſeen to ferment anew. A conſpiracy was formed at Prague, and it was to break out on the 16th of May. It was cuſtomary on that day for multitudes of the common people to throng into town, to celebrate the feaſt of St. Jean Nepomucene. At the time of this immenſe concourſe of people from the country, ſome thouſands of armed Conſpirators were ſuddenly to appear; others were to make themſelves maſters of the bridge and gates; others again were to mix among the people; to harangue them, to announce the dawn of riſing Liberty, and to exhort them to throw off the yoke of Slavery, and to take poſſeſſion of thoſe lands which they had ſo long watered with the ſweat of their brows, and whoſe fruit only enriched a ſet of tyrannical, haughty, vain, and idle Lords.

Such language, it may eaſily be conceived, muſt have made a ſtrong impreſſion on men who, for the greateſt part, cultivated lands which they only

held at the pleaſure of the Lord, in conſideration of ſo many days work every week, employed in the culture of the Lord's lands *. Arms were to be diſtributed to this populace ſuddenly heated by the cry of Liberty and Equality. The Lords and the rich were to fall the firſt victims of their fury; the lands diſtributed to the murderers, and

* The peaſantry called *Robota* were not all in an equal degree of ſlavery. Some held their lands for three, others for four days labour per week. However juſt the conditions of ſuch a ſervitude were in themſelves, it was nevertheleſs difficult for the traveller accuſtomed to other governments not to be perſuaded, that theſe men were very unhappy. I was of that opinion, when an unexpected ſight nearly reconciled me to that mode of adminiſtration. It was an immenſe granary belonging to the Lord. In the middle of a large hall were vaſt heaps of corn; around the place as many diviſions as there were families in the village, and each diviſion contained the corn belonging to one family. An overſeer attended at the diſtributions, which were made once a week. If the ſtock of any particular diviſion was exhauſted, the neceſſary quantity was taken from the Lord's heap for the family in need, who were to replace the corn ſo taken at the enſuing harveſt. By this means the pooreſt peaſant was certain of his ſuſtenance. Let the reader decide, whether ſuch a government may not be as good as others, where the poor man may often ſtarve in the poſſeſſion of perfect Liberty. I know what might be wiſhed for under every adminiſtration; but it is not the part of true Philoſophy to overthrow exiſting governments in the chimerical idea of reducing, ſome day or other, every thing to its own plans.

Liberty

Liberty proclaimed, we ſhould have beheld Bohemia the firſt Republican offspring of Philoſophim.

Secretly however as this plot was carried on, ſome of the adepts ere long betrayed the ſecret.—Maria Thereſa, the Empreſs Queen, found means of ſtifling the whole, and her council behaved with ſo much prudence and dexterity, that the public journals of the time ſcarcely mention it. Perhaps the court judged wiſely, and thought it prudent to gain over the chiefs, rather than by executions to call the attention of the public to principles which have but too often ſtained Bohemia with the blood of its beſt inhabitants.

New plans of the Auſtrian Sophiſters.

Notwithſtanding the very ſmall ſucceſs that had attended their attempt, the Sophiſters of the Danube and Moldau did not loſe all hopes of effectuating their ſchemes of Equality. They invented a plan which drew the Empreſs Queen into the deluſion, and ſtill more her ſucceſſor Joſeph II. —The apparent object of this plan was, that proprietors whoſe lands were ſo extenſive that they were unable to cultivate them, ſhould be obliged to cede a part of ſuch lands to the peaſantry. Theſe, in return, were to pay an annual rent to the former proprietors equal in value to the eſtimated revenue. Each community was to engage to puniſh ſeverely every peaſant who ſhould neglect either the cultivation of the land ceded, or the payment of the ſettled rent.

This plan was preſented to the Empreſs Queen with ſo much art, that ſhe was perſuaded it had no other view than the enriching of the ſtate by favouring the induſtry and encouraging the emulation of the real cultivators. She therefore gave orders to various agents of government to ſend in Memorials on the ſubject: and herſelf tried the experiment by ceding ſome of the crown lands on the aforementioned conditions.

The Sophiſters feared the delay attendant on ſuch deliberations; and, to haſten the general execution of their projects, they ſpread their propoſitions and plans among the peaſantry. Their moſt ardent miſſionary was an intriguing prieſt, who ran to and fro throughout the country, preaching up this reformation of property which he thought admirable. He found it no difficult taſk to infuſe a portion of his enthuſiaſm into his ruſtic auditors. The Nobles, viewing this plan in no other light than as a means of deſpoiling them of their property under the pretence of a juſt compenſation, objected that the peaſantry, become maſters and proprietors of the land, would ſoon find means of turning the whole profit to their own uſe; and that Philoſophiſm would ſoon invent new reaſons for paying no retribution whatever to the Lords (for would it not be doubly unjuſt to carry any part of the produce of lands to Lords who neither cultivated nor had any *property* in them); in fine, ſhould

it

it ever pleaſe the peaſantry to league together and refuſe all payments, the Lords would have loſt both their lands and money, and the Nobility, thus reduced, would be able to find no other means of ſubſiſtence than by entering into the ſervice of their *quondam* tenants *.

This oppoſition only contributed to ſtimulate the zeal of the levelling apoſtles. They had given the peaſantry every hope of ſucceſs, and it was eaſy to irritate them againſt their opponents. It was ſoon to be perceived that thoſe vaſſals who had always been ſo mild and humble with reſpect to their Lords had now aſſumed a haughty and inſolent Inſurrection in Bohemia.

* This may ſerve to explain the theory of the French Emigration. A friend of mine, who had exerciſed an almoſt boundleſs charity in the manor of which he was Lord, was nearly murdered in the general inſurrection of 1789, by that peaſantry which he had preſerved from the inclemency of the foregoing winter. He was however fortunate enough to eſcape the hands of the aſſaſſins, and, returning to his former manſion, was received with acclamations of joy. On expoſtulating with his tenants on the treatment he had lately received they begged his pardon in theſe words: ſaying, "Ah "Sir, we were miſled; we were made to believe that if we "burnt your title deeds and got rid of you, we ſhould have "nothing to pay, and ſhould remain proprietors of the lands "we hold; but we aſk pardon," &c. He thus eſcaped the agents, but was afterwards purſued by the revolutionary leaders called Deputies, and is at preſent involved in the general decree of death pronounced againſt the Emigrants. T.

mien. It was neceſſary to reſort to puniſhments, which only added to their complaints and murmurs. The Empreſs Queen, ſtill miſled by the apparent juſtice of the plan, and the Emperor, whoſe Philoſophiſm and ambition ſecretly enjoyed the hopes of humiliating the Nobility, were imprudent enough to receive the complaints of thoſe whom the Lords had thought neceſſary to puniſh. This ſort of connivance gave our ruſtic revolters reaſon to believe, that they had nothing to fear on the part of government. The Sophiſtical emiſſaries perſuaded them, that they ought to obtain by force what in juſtice could not be refuſed them. Such inſinuations naturally produced violence, and in 1773, the inſurrection of the peaſantry againſt the Nobility was almoſt univerſal throughout Bohemia.

The ruſtics already began to burn and pillage * the caſtles; the Nobility and the rich proprietors were menaced with a general maſſacre. The Empreſs Queen came to a tardy ſenſe of the fault ſhe had committed; but then at leaſt ſhe loſt no time to cruſh the growing evil. An army of 28,000 men received orders to march and to quell the rioters. The Sophiſters had not had the time neceſſary to organize their Revolutionary bands, and the revolters were ſoon defeated.

* The fate of France 1789.

Thoſe

Thoſe parts of Pruſſia and Sileſia which border on Bohemia had felt the commotion, and it was then that Frederic firſt divined the intentions of the Sophiſters. He had not courted them ſo far as to diſband his army. He was even more reſolute than the Empreſs Queen in eradicating the ſpirit of revolt. He immediately hung up the mutineers; and our levelling Philoſophiſts were ſtill obliged quietly to behold thoſe diſguſting diſtinctions of Lords and peaſants, of Nobles and rich. But they were only pacified for the moment, and never loſt ſight of their plans. The death of the Empreſs Queen gave them an occaſion of making ſtill more perfidious eſſays for the deſtruction of the Nobility.

Joſeph II.'s prevention againſt the Nobles, and plan for humbling them.

Initiated in the Sophiſticated myſteries, Joſeph II. had found means of combining the ideas of Liberty and Equality with thoſe of the Deſpot; and under pretence of reigning like a Philoſopher, levelled every thing around him, that he and his ſyſtems might tower alone above the ruined plane. With his pretended liberty of conſcience, he would have been the greateſt perſecutor of his age, had not the French Revolution followed him ſo cloſely. With his pretended equality, he only ſought to vilify and plunder the Nobility, and to fling their fortunes into the hands of their vaſſals, in order to overthrow the laws of the Empire, and thoſe of property as well as thoſe of religion, that

he might not meet with a greater oppoſition from the Nobility than he would from their vaſſals.—With all his pretenſions to genius, the moſt awful leſſons were neceſſary to perſuade him that the real tendency of this Philoſophiſm of Equality and of religious and political Liberty, was the deſtruction of the throne as well as of the altar.

Such was the Philoſophy of that Prince: whatever may have been his intentions, his innovating genius was unfortunate enough to furniſh the pretext for a moſt cruel inſurrection againſt the Nobility of a large portion of his dominions. The celerity with which he was accuſtomed to make himſelf obeyed, may caſt cruel doubts on the dilatory manner in which he went to the ſuccour of the unhappy victims.

All that I am about to relate concerning this memorable event, the atrocious memory of which the court of Vienna vainly attempted to ſtifle, ſhall be extracted from a relation written by Mr. J. Petty, an Engliſh gentleman whom I knew to be one of thoſe who had eſcaped from the maſſacre, and is now living at Betchworth near Darking, in the County of Surry. It was to his memorial I alluded when I ſpoke of one more particularly inſtructive as to effects. The other, from which I have extracted the greater part of what has been already ſeen in this Chapter, has a greater application to cauſes, and ſhows the connection

nection between thoſe facts and the progreſs of Philoſophiſm and Jacobiniſm in the Auſtrian dominions. On conſidering theſe two memorials collectively, we ſee that it was at Vienna where the Sophiſters, under the cloak of Humanity and Liberty, were inventing every means either for the deſtruction of the Nobility, or to oblige the Lords to renounce their ancient rights over their vaſſals and villains, and that the orders given by Joſeph II. for the mode of defence of the frontiers of Tranſilvania furniſhed the means or the occaſion for executing their plans. Theſe orders were ſuch, that they were calculated either to rob the Hungarian Lords of their vaſſals, or to throw them into open rebellion againſt their maſters.

Antecedent to this new plan adopted by the Emperor, the chain of troops deſtined for the guard of the Turkiſh frontiers was compoſed of peaſants or villains, who were exempted from a part of their ordinary labours in conſideration of this military duty; but were not on that account exempt from dependence on their maſters. In the ſpring of the year 1781, Joſeph II. ſent the Major General Geny to Hermanſtadt, with orders to augment the number of theſe guards, and to put them on the ſame footing as the reſt of the Imperial troops; that is to ſay, in a ſtate of perfect independence on their former Lords. The propoſed indemnifications did not, however, prevent

numerous

numerous reclamations being made. What ſeemed to juſtify this oppoſition, and what was eaſy to be foreſeen (which perhaps might have been the real object of the Sophiſters), was, that the peaſantry flocked in crouds to be enrolled, and by that means enfranchize themſelves from all ſubmiſſion and from any ſervices or duties to their Lords.— I muſt own with truth, and in uniſon with Mr. Petty, that the fate of the peaſantry or villains was much aggravated by the harſhneſs of ſome of their maſters.

Inſurrection occaſioned in Tranſilvania by this new plan.

In the mean time, until an anſwer to the reclamations of the Nobility and proprietors could be obtained from Vienna, the commander in chief at Hermanſtadt thought it incumbent on him to declare, that theſe new enrollments ſhould be conſidered as operating no change in the political ſituation of the peaſantry, until further orders and inſtructions ſhould be received from the Emperor. But thoſe orders did not arrive, and the commander in chief had made his declaration too late.— Thoſe villains who had enrolled themſelves not only looked upon their enfranchizement as complete, but committed ſuch exceſſes againſt their former maſters, that the Magiſtrates were obliged to apply to the commander in chief for the revocation of all the enrollments, as the only method of reſtoring order. But the revocation proved uſeleſs; it was well known that the Emperor had returned

returned no anſwer. The peaſantry, in lieu of peaceably ſubmitting to their injured Lords, perſiſted in looking upon themſelves as independent ſoldiers, when on a ſudden there appeared a Valachian peaſant of the name of Horja who gathered a multitude of them around him. He, decorated with a large ſtar and bearing a patent written in golden letters, declared himſelf ſent by the Emperor to enroll them all. He offered to put himſelf at their head and to reſtore them to their liberty. The peaſantry flocked to their new general. The Lords and Proprietors ſent daily information to the government and to the commander in chief at Hermanſtadt of what was paſſing; of the ſecret committees which were held in different parts, and of the inſurrection which was on the eve of burſting forth. Reproaches for their apprehenſions and timidity were the only anſwers they received.

Maſſacre of the Nobility of Tranſilvania.

The day marked out by the Conſpirators was approaching, and on the 3d November 1784 Horja appeared at the head of four thouſand men. He formed different detachments and ſent them to burn the caſtles and murder the Lords and proprietors. Theſe forerunners of the Jacobin Galley Slaves of Marſeilles executed his orders with that ſanguinary fury which they had imbibed againſt the Nobility from the doctrines of Equality, and the

the rebels ſoon counted 12,000 men following their levelling ſtandards. In a very ſhort ſpace of time fifty Noblemen were murdered. Carnage and deſolation now ſpread from county to county; the houſes of the Nobility were every where burnt and ranſacked, and mere aſſaſſination could no longer ſatiate their ſanguinary fury. The unhappy Noblemen who fell into their hands were put to the moſt excruciating tortures. Some were impaled alive, their hands and feet cut off, and roaſted at a ſlow fire, for ſuch is the humanity of levellers!!—But we will not attempt to comment on the relation we have before us; to extract is a taſk ſufficiently diſtreſſing. "Among the caſtles "which were reduced to aſhes the moſt remarka-"ble were thoſe of the Counts D'Eſterhazy and "Tekeli; and of the Noblemen who were mur-"dered the moſt diſtinguiſhed were the two "Counts and Brothers Rebiezi. The eldeſt was "ſpitted and roaſted; many others of the ſame "family, men, women and children, were cruel-"ly maſſacred. The unfortunate Lady Bradi-"ſador, with whom I had ſpent a few days (ſays "Mr. Petty), alſo fell a melancholy victim.—"Theſe barbarians ſeized her, cut off her hands "and feet, and then left her to linger in that "ſtate till ſhe expired. But let us turn from ſuch "horrid ſubjects: They recall to my mind per-"ſons forever dear to me, who fell a moſt wanton

"ſacrifice

" ſacrifice to cruelty, on which I have not the " courage to dilate."

We alſo would gladly have withheld ſuch bloody recitals from our readers; but, when compared to our Septembrizing Jacobins, they become marking features in hiſtory. And how much more ſtriking would theſe leſſons be, was it here the place to enumerate the many ſimilar attacks againſt the nobility with which our Memoirs on Ancient Jacobiniſm are replete. We ſhould there ſee that ſame Philoſophiſm of Liberty and Equality forming the ſame plots and perpetrating the ſame atrocities againſt that part of ſociety diſtinguiſhed by its titles, rank, or riches; and the Ariſtocracy may learn from their own hiſtory the danger of encouraging ſophiſticated levellers, who never fawn on them but in hopes of tearing to pieces and devouring the whole of that claſs which is diſtinguiſhed by riches and honors.

The connection between the ancient and modern inſurrections againſt the Nobility.

In making a compariſon between the Jacobins of the preſent day and their forefathers, I ſhould not conceal thoſe horrid ſights of noblemen roaſting, of women mutilated, of whole families maſſacred, or of the palpitating members of fathers, mothers and children in Tranſilvania. Nor ſhould I paſs over thoſe cannibals of the *Place Dauphine* burning at a ſlow fire (on the 3d of September 1792) the Counteſs of *Perignan* and her daughters, Madame *de Chevres*, and ſo many other victims,

victims, offering the fleſh of thoſe whom they had already butchered as food to thoſe who were next to be ſacrificed. Such horrid deeds are far from being novelries in the annals of the ſect *. Nor was it reſerved to the Carmagnols of Paris or of Tranſilvania to ſhow the example of ſuch cruelties.

Theſe ſtatements I know will make my reader ſhudder with horror, but it is a ſalutary tremor. At length perhaps they will ceaſe to hearken to thoſe Sophiſtical Apoſtles of a Liberty and Equality leſs chimerical than atrocious, and whoſe ſyſtems aſſimilate man to the ferocious beaſts of

* In our *Hiſtory of the Clergy during the French Revolution*, we mentioned theſe atrocious facts of the Place Dauphine, which ſome of our readers called in queſtion, becauſe they had not witneſſed them, though in Paris at the time; but let it be recollected, it was a time when terror would ſcarcely permit them to raiſe their heads from their hiding places. Let them conſult the writings of Mr. Girtanner, a Swiſs phyſician, who was an eye witneſs to what he relates. They will learn that the work from which I had made the extract was only a tranſlation from his work, nor did I know at that time that the *Baron de Peleſſier Vien* was the tranſlator, as I have ſince learned from himſelf. I have alſo ſeen Mr. Cambden, chaplain to one of the Iriſh regiments. He had printed the ſame account at Liege, and declared to me that he had only publiſhed it on the teſtimony of twenty different witneſſes, who all aſſured him that Mr. Gertanner and myſelf had been ſo far from exaggerating the fact, that we had ſtopped far ſhort of the horrors of that ſanguinary ſcene.

the

the foreſt. The error is too fatal; let us therefore guard againſt the deluſions of pride by the remembrance of deeds humiliating to nature itſelf. We have witneſſed the ſanguinary conſequences of theſe vain ſyſtems of Liberty and Equality in our own times; let us venture to examine for a moment what courſe they took in the days of our anceſtors.

In 1358 France had its Jacobins, and their ſyſtem was *Liberty and Equality*. Froiſſard, one of the moſt eſteemed French Hiſtorians, paints their conduct as follows:

"In the month of May 1358 France was "ſtricken with a ſtrange deſolation. Some country "people, without a chief, and at firſt not one "hundred in number, aſſembled in the Beau-"voiſis, declaring that the nobility were a diſhonor "to the nation, and that it would be a meritorious "act to deſtroy them all. Their companions "anſwered, 'It is true, and evil fall upon the "man who ſhall not do his utmoſt to deſtroy "the nobility.' They then gathered together, "having no other arms than ſticks tipped with "iron, and knives, and immediately proceeded "to the neighbouring manſion of a nobleman. "After having murdered him, his wife and chil-"dren, not ſparing the infant babes, they ſet fire "to his houſe. They then proceeded to another "caſtle, where ſeizing on the Chevalier, they of-

"fered

" fered violence to his wife and daughter, and af-
" terwards murdered them in his preſence, with
" the reſt of his children; they then butchered
" him, and levelled his caſtle with the ground.
" They treated ſeveral other country houſes and
" caſtles in the ſame manner. Their numbers in-
" creaſed to ſix thouſand, and they were joined
" every where as they went by their equals; the
" others fled through terror, carrying their wives
" and children with them to the diſtance of ten or
" twenty leagues, leaving their houſes and valu-
" ables at the mercy of the robbers. Theſe wicked
" wretches, without chiefs, buffetted, burnt, and
" maſſacred every nobleman they met with, and
" offered the moſt unheard-of violences to the
" wives and daughters of their victims. He who
" committed the greateſt exceſſes and horrors
" (deeds that neither can nor ought to be deſcribed)
" was the moſt exalted among them, and looked
" upon as the moſt diſtinguiſhed leader. I could
" not dare recite the treatment which women
" met with from them. Among other horrors
" which they committed, they ſeized a noble-
" man, murdered him, ſpitted him, and roaſted
" him in the preſence of his wife and children *.

" They

* When the unfortunate Chevalier Dillon was murdered by his own ſoldiers at Liſle, after having made him languiſh from nine in the morning till ſeven at night with a broken thigh from

"They forced this unhappy woman to eat of the "fleſh of her huſband, and then made her under- "go a moſt ſhocking death.

"Theſe wicked wretches burnt and deſtroyed "above ſixty caſtles in the Beauvoiſin and in the "neighbourhood of Corbie, Amiens, and Mont- "didier. They deſtroyed above a hundred in "the county of Valois, and the biſhopricks of "Laon, Noyon, and Soiſſons *."

It is worthy of remark, that when theſe wretches were aſked what induced them to commit ſuch horrors, they anſwered, 'That they did not know.' Such was the preciſe anſwer which our firſt incendiaries gave when aſked why they burned the caſtles; ſuch alſo would have been the anſwer of our Tranſilvanian Carmagnoles. Whence did that

from a piſtol ball which one of the cuiraſſiers under his command had fired at him in the field. As he entered the gates of Liſle he received three more ſhots, which put an end to his exiſtence, and his body was dragged to the *Grande Place, where it was roaſted, and pieces of his fleſh ſold for two-pence and three-pence to the ſtanders-by.* On the 11th of Auguſt, I was eye-witneſs to the burning of the bodies of many of the Swiſs in large bonfires, made of the wood-work of the guard-houſes and out-houſes of the Thuilleries, while men covered with blood and ſmoke were beating down with long poles the fleſh which bloated up from the heat. Large piles of burnt bones lay by the fires, which had been kindled ſoon after the attack upon the palace the day before, which proved that ſuch had been their amuſement during the preceding night. T.

* Froiſſard's Chronicle, Ed. of Lyons 1559, Chap. 182.

clown who became their chief procure his ſtar and his patents written in golden letters? Who had forged them, if not the ſame ſect that in 1789 forged the pretended orders of Lewis XVI. ſent to the peaſantry in Dauphiné to burn the caſtles and chaſe the nobles? The pretext was every where the ſame, and the like evils flowed from the ſame, though *hidden, ſource.*

Beſides, there is a moſt terrible cloud impending over this inſurrection of the peaſantry in Tranſilvania againſt the nobility. In the commencement the government of Hermanſtadt refuſed to ſend ſuccours on pretence that their alarms were groundleſs, when it was impoſſible to deny the horrors committed by the inſurgents. Soldiers were ſent, but without orders to act. At firſt appearance one would have thought they were in an underſtanding with the banditti, who continued their devaſtations without fearing to be repreſſed by the ſoldiery. The troops, having no orders, were reduced to be tranquil ſpectators of the caſtles in flames (the incendiaries even marching before them), and heard the unhappy victims calling for ſuccour in the agonies of death, but in vain; they had not the power to act. At length ſuch of the nobles as had eſcaped the general maſſacre, being joined by thoſe of the neighbouring counties, formed themſelves into a body, marched againſt the inſurgents, and defeated them in various

rious encounters; and Horja, with his followers who were ſtill numerous, was obliged to retire into the mountains. He there gathered freſh forces, and renewed his devaſtating and ſanguinary courſe. Then at leaſt it was impoſſible not to give the troops orders to act. But the cloud becomes ſtill more impenetrable. When the inſurgents pillaged Abrud-Banga the *Caiſſe d'Eſcompte* belonging to the Royal Chamber fell into their hands; but they would not touch it becauſe it belonged to the Emperor: And ſoon after a detachment of a Lieutenant and only *twenty-four* men came to eſcort the cheſt to Zalatna. On their march a numerous party of Horja's followers might have ſeized it again, when one of the inſurgents advancing propoſed a parly between their Chief and the Lieutenant. The Chief advanced, ſaying, "We are not to be conſidered as rebels. "We love and adore the Emperor in whoſe ſer-"vice we are. Our ſole object is to throw off "the tyrannical yoke of the nobility, which we "can bear no longer. Go and tell the Officers "of the Chamber of Zalatna, that they have no-"thing to fear from us."

Notwithſtanding the fidelity with which they adhered to their promiſe, it was neceſſary to order the troops to act; and in various encounters many priſoners were made from the inſurgents. I could wiſh that it had fallen to my taſk to praiſe the ge-

neroſity of the nobility on this occaſion. But my Hiſtorian accuſes them of having cruelly revenged themſelves on a multitude of unhappy perſons, who had only joined the revolters through compulſion. A cruel Magiſtrate condemned them all indiſcriminately, and in ſuch numbers, that an Auſtrian Major threatened to make him reſponſible to the Emperor for all the innocent blood which he had ſpilt.

This harſh treatment of the priſoners ſtimulated Horja and his followers to new cruelties againſt the nobility. He intrenched himſelf again in the mountains, and they in vain offered him a general amneſty. He was beginning to renew his depredations the following year, when he was taken by a ſtratagem. The inſurgents, diſconcerted, craved peace, and laid down their arms.

Such was the concluſion of a conſpiracy, which was no more than an eſſay made in thoſe diſtant provinces by the Sophiſters of Liberty and Equality of what they were contriving elſewhere, to level every head which towered above the vulgar. The apparent cauſe, and which might have greatly contributed in reality, was the exceſſive abuſe of their rights and the oppreſſion over their vaſſals exerciſed by the nobility of Tranſilvania. The tone of moderation and veracity with which the relation we have followed is written, leaves no room to doubt of theſe oppreſſions; and in that

point

point of view this terrible inſurrection would be foreign to the object of our memoirs. But the inſurrection of the negroes may alſo be attributed to the harſhneſs of the treatment they underwent; yet it is nevertheleſs univerſally known, that all the atrocious crimes and barbarities committed by the inſurgent ſlaves againſt their maſters at St. Domingo, Martinico, and Guadaloupe, are to be traced to the plots combined by the levelling Sophiſters in Paris.

It is preciſely in a ſimilar light that the inſurrection in Tranſilvania is repreſented in a narrative which we received from a perſon who was more in the way of obſerving the progreſs of Philoſophiſm in Vienna and the other Auſtrian dominions. He was acquainted with their plots, he refuted the pretences, and foreſaw the fatal conſequences; he even more than once declared them to the Auſtrian government; but he was not more hearkened to than many others whoſe words have been but too fatally verified by the horrid Revolution.

In the memoirs of this accurate obſerver on the inſurrection of Tranſilvania, I ſee him combine the efforts of our modern Sophiſters with thoſe of a ſect long ſince lurking in the Occult Lodges of Free-maſonry.

At the epoch we are now deſcribing ſuch indeed was the union between the Sophiſters and the Craft, and ſuch was the mutual ſuccour which they

lent to each other, that it was impoſſible to develop the progreſs of the one without ſeeking the origin of the other, without expoſing their common hatreds and common ſyſtems, and the combinations of their mutual plots into one and the ſame conſpiracy againſt Chriſt and his altars, againſt Kings and their thrones. Our object therefore in the remaining chapters will be, to reveal the myſteries of Free-maſonry, to explain the means and ſuccours it afforded to the modern Sophiſters in the French Revolution, and to ſhow how fatal their union has already been, and how much it threatens the ſocial order of the whole world.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the General Secret, or Leſſer Myſteries, of Free-maſonry.

IN treating of Free-maſonry truth and juſtice rigorouſly compel us to begin with an exception that exculpates the greater part of thoſe brethren who have been initiated, and who would have conceived a juſt horror for this aſſociation, had they been able to foreſee that it could ever make them contract obligations which militated againſt the duties of the religious man and of the true citizen. Diſtinctions and exceptions to be made among the Free-maſons.

England in particular is full of thoſe upright men, who, excellent Citizens, and of all ſtations, are proud of being Maſons, and who may be diſtinguiſhed from the others by ties which only appear to unite them more cloſely in the bonds of charity and fraternal affection. It is not the fear of offending a nation in which I have found an aſylum that has ſuggeſted this exception. Gratitude on the contrary would ſilence every vain terror, and I ſhould be ſeen exclaiming in the very ſtreets of London that England was loſt, that it could not eſcape the French Revolution, if its Free-maſon Of Engliſh Maſons.

Lodges were ſimilar to thoſe of which I am about to treat. I would ſay more, that Chriſtianity and all government would have long been at an end in England, if it could be even ſuppoſed that her Maſons were initiated into the laſt myſteries of the ſect. Long ſince have their Lodges been ſufficiently numerous to execute ſuch a deſign, had the Engliſh Maſons adopted either the means or the plans and plots of the Occult Lodges.

This argument alone might ſuffice to except the Engliſh Maſons in general from what I have to ſay of the ſect. But there exiſt many paſſages in the hiſtory of Maſonry which neceſſitate this exception. The following appears convincing.—At the time when the Illuminés of Germany, the moſt deteſtable of the Jacobin crew, were ſeeking to ſtrengthen their party by that of Maſonry, they affected a ſovereign contempt for the Engliſh Lodges. In the letters of Philo to Spartacus we ſee the Engliſh adepts arriving in Germany from London dawbed all over with the ribbands and emblems of their degrees, but void of thoſe plans and projects againſt the altar and the crown which tend directly to the point. When I ſhall have given the hiſtory of theſe Illuminés the reader will eaſily judge what immenſe weight ſuch a teſtimony carries with it, in favour of the Engliſh Lodges. It is glorious for them to ſee themſelves deſpiſed by the

the moſt unrelenting enemies of the altar, of the throne, and of all ſociety*.

For a conſiderable length of time a ſimilar exception might have been made of the generality of Lodges both in France and Germany. Some of them not only publiſhed proteſtations, but receded from Maſonry as ſoon as they perceived it to be infected by thoſe revolutionary principles which the Illuminés had infuſed among the brethren†. In ſhort the number of exceptions to be made for upright Maſons is beyond the conception of thoſe who are not thoroughly acquainted with the principles and proceedings of the ſect.—In fact, how is it poſſible to conceive, that in ſo numerous an aſſociation, where its members are united by bonds and oaths to which they are moſt religiouſly attached, ſo very few of its adepts ſhould be acquainted with the grand object of the aſſociation itſelf? This enigma would have been eaſily underſtood had we publiſhed (as we hope to do) the hiſtory of antient Jacobiniſm with that of the middle age, before we had digeſted theſe memoirs of modern Jacobiniſm. But to ſupply this deficiency, and to methodize our ideas on this famous aſſociation, we will begin by treating of

Exceptions with reſpect to other countries.

* See letter of Philo to Spartacus.

† See the ſpeech of a Maſter pronounced in a Bavarian Lodge.

the

the ſecret which is common to all the degrees, that is to ſay, of what may be called the leſſer myſteries; and thence proceeding to the ſecret and doctrine of the Occult Lodges, we will treat of the grand myſteries of Maſonry. We will alſo treat of its origin and of its propagation; in fine, of its coalition with the conſpiring Sophiſters, and of the means it afforded them of executing their plans againſt the altar and the throne.

The general ſecret diſcovered by the Maſons themſelves.

Until the 12th of Auguſt 1792, the French Jacobins had only dated the annals of their Revolution by the years of their pretended *Liberty*. On that day Lewis XVI. who had been declared forty-eight hours before to have forfeited his right to the crown, was carried priſoner to the Tower of the Temple (ſo called becauſe it formerly belonged to the Knights Templars). On that day the rebel aſſembly decreed, that to the date of *Liberty*, the date of *Equality* ſhould be added in future in all public acts, and the decree itſelf was dated the fourth year of *Liberty*, the firſt year and firſt day of *Equality*.

It was on that day, for the firſt time, that the ſecret of Free-maſonry was made public; that ſecret ſo dear to them, and which they preſerved with all the ſolemnity of the moſt inviolable oath. At the reading of this famous decree, they exclaimed, 'We have at length ſucceeded, and France is no other than an immenſe lodge. The whole French

French people are Free-maſons, and the whole univerſe will ſoon follow their example.'

I witneſſed this enthuſiaſm, I heard the converſations to which it give riſe. I ſaw Maſons, till then the moſt reſerved, who freely and openly declared, "Yes, at length the grand object of "Free-maſonry is accompliſhed, EQUALITY and "LIBERTY; *all men are equal and brothers*; *all* "*men are free.* That was the whole ſubſtance of "our doctrine, the object of our wiſhes, THE "WHOLE *of our* GRAND SECRET." Such was the language I heard fall from the moſt zealous Maſons, from thoſe whom I have ſeen decorated with all the inſignia of the deepeſt Maſonry, and who enjoyed the rights of *Venerable* to preſide over Lodges. I have heard them expreſs themſelves in this manner before thoſe whom Maſons would call *the prophane*, without requiring the ſmalleſt ſecrecy either from the men or women preſent. They ſaid it in a tone as if they wiſhed all France ſhould be acquainted with this glorious atchievement of Maſonry; as if it were to recognize in them its benefactors and the authors of that Revolution of *Liberty and Equality* of which it had given ſo grand an example to all Europe.

Such in reality was the general ſecret of the Free-maſons. It was ſimilar to what in the games of the ancients were called the leſſer myſteries, common to all degrees; and though the word expreſſed the

the whole, it was not wholly underſtood by all.—Its progreſſive explanation, while it renders it innocent in ſome, renders it monſtrous in others.—In the mean time, before we have accounted for this difference, let not the Maſon, whatever may be his degree, inculpate us if as in Paris this famous ſecret ceaſes to continue one. Too many of the prophane were acquainted with it in that Revolutionary country, for it to remain a ſecret in others. Even thoſe in England who may ſtill wiſh to keep it, will vainly object that we have been miſled; they will ſoon ſee whether it was poſſible for us to be ſo. Were we deſtitute of other evidence, we might ſafely aſſert, that thoſe Maſons did not miſlead us, who were actuated by no other paſſion than that of the glory of the ſect when they revealed thoſe myſteries which when ſecure of their execution ceaſed to be myſterious. Thoſe again did not miſlead us, who, formerly initiated into thoſe myſteries, at length owned that they had been dupes: That all that Liberty and Equality which they had treated as mere play had already proved a moſt deſperate game for their country, and might bring ruin on the whole univerſe. And I have met with many of theſe adepts ſince the Revolution, both in France and elſewhere, who had formerly been zealous Maſons, but latterly confeſſing with bitterneſs this fatal ſecret, which reduces the whole ſcience of Maſonry, like

like the French Revolution, to theſe two words *Liberty and Equality.*

I once more conjure the upright Maſons not to look upon themſelves as accuſed of wiſhing to eſtabliſh a ſimilar Revolution. When I ſhall have verified this article of their doctrine, the eſſence and the baſis of all their myſteries, I will ſhow how it came to paſs that ſo many noble and virtuous characters were initiated without even ſuſpecting the ultimate deſign. But for the hiſtory of the Revolution, it is neceſſary that the moſt diſtant doubt ſhould not ſubſiſt as to this *fundamental ſecret.* If this were not made clear, it would be impoſſible for the reader to comprehend the help which the Sophiſters of Rebellion and Impiety acquired from Maſonry. I ſhall therefore ſeek other proofs beſide theſe avowals, which many others muſt have heard like me from the adepts, ſince their ſucceſſes in France had made them regard ſecrecy in future as ſuperfluous. Other proofs of the ſecret.

Antecedent to theſe avowals, there was an eaſy method of diſcovering that Liberty and Equality were the grand objects of Maſonry. The very name of *Free*-maſon carries with it the idea of Liberty; as to *Equality* it was diſguiſed under the term *Fraternity*, which has nearly a ſimilar ſignification. But who has not heard the Maſon brag of the Equality which reigned in their Lodges, where Princes and Nobles, the rich and the poor,

all

all were *equal*, all were brothers: That diſtinctions of rank no longer exiſted when once paſſed the Tyler *; and that the ſole appellation uſed among them was that of Brother, the only name alſo which gives us an idea of perfect Equality.

It is true, that it was expreſsly forbidden to any Maſon ever to write theſe two words *Liberty and Equality* conſecutively, or give the leaſt hint that their ſecret reſided in the union of theſe two grand principles; and that law was ſo exactly obſerved by their writers, that I do not remember ever to have ſeen it tranſgreſſed among the numerous volumes which I have read, though of the moſt ſecret ſort, on the different degrees. Mirabeau himſelf, when he pretended to reveal the ſecrets of Maſonry, only dared reveal them in part. The order of Free-maſonry, which is ſpread all over the world, he ſays, has for its objects, Charity, *Equality of ſtations*, and perfect harmony †.—Though *this Equality of ſtations* ſeems pretty well to denote the Liberty which muſt exiſt in this Equality, ſtill Mirabeau, who was a Maſon himſelf, knew that the time was not yet come, when his brethren would pardon him for avowing that in theſe two words conſiſted their general ſecret;

* The Officer ſtanding at the door with a drawn ſword to receive the ſign, and admit only the real Members.

† Eſſay on the Illuminés, Chap. 15.

but

but this very reſervedneſs ſufficiently denotes how much both the one and the other were held precious in their myſteries. If we refer to the hymns and ſongs ſung in chorus at their feſtivals, we ſhall generally find ſome verſes or ſtanza in honour of Liberty or of Equality *. In the ſame way we may often remark either the one or the other to be the ſubject of the diſcourſes they have pronounced, and which are ſometimes printed.

Were I even deprived of theſe proofs, ſtill it would be incumbent on me to declare what perſonal knowledge I may have acquired.

Though I have ſeen ſo many Maſons who ſince the famous decree of *Equality* have ſpoken in the moſt open manner of this famous ſecret (though the oath which they had taken ſhould have made them more reſerved on it than me, who never took any oath either in their Lodges, or to the Revolution of Liberty and Equality), I ſhould nevertheleſs be perfectly ſilent on all that I have wit-

* It is for this reaſon, that amidſt all their encomiums on benevolence, which is the chief object of their ſongs, we ſee the Engliſh always add ſome lines in the ſenſe of the following:

Maſons have long been free,
And may they ever be, &c.
Princes and Kings our brothers are, &c.

Theſe lines, however, notwithſtanding their tendency to Liberty and Equality, are not to be underſtood in a Jacobinal light in the mouth of an Engliſh Maſon.

neſſed,

neſſed, were I not thoroughly convinced how much it imported all nations, to be acquainted with the ultimate tendency of Maſonry. I ſhould be ſorry to ſee thouſands of upright Maſons, eſpecially in England, take offence at the diſcovery of their ſecret; but ſuch virtuous and upright men are not thoſe who would prefer the vain-glory of their ſecret to the public welfare, or to the proper precautions to be taken againſt the abuſes of Maſonry; in a word againſt an abominable ſect who, under the pretence of virtue, wiſh to miſlead the univerſe. I ſhall ſpeak openly and without the fear of diſpleaſing thoſe Maſons whom I eſteem and revere; and ſhall but little trouble myſelf about the diſpleaſure of others whoſe perſons I contemn and whoſe plots I abhor.

The Author admitted to the Lodges, and how?

During the laſt twenty years it was difficult, eſpecially in Paris, to meet perſons who did not belong to the ſociety of Maſonry. I was acquainted with many, and ſome were my intimate friends. Theſe, with all that zeal common to young adepts, frequently preſſed me to become one of their brotherhood. As I conſtantly refuſed, they undertook to enroll me notwithſtanding my refuſal.—The plan ſettled, I was invited to dinner at a friend's houſe and was the only prophane in the midſt of a large party of Maſons. Dinner over and the ſervants ordered to withdraw, it was propoſed to form themſelves into a Lodge, and to initiate

tiate me. I perſiſted in my refuſal, and particularly refuſed to take the oath of keeping a ſecret, the very object of which was unknown to me. They diſpenſed with the oath, but I ſtill refuſed. They became more preſſing, telling me that Maſonry was perfectly innocent, and that its morality was unobjectionable: In reply, I aſked whether it was better than that of the Goſpel. They only anſwered by forming themſelves into a Lodge, when began all thoſe grimaces and childiſh ceremonies which are deſcribed in books of Maſonry, ſuch as Jachin and Bôaz. I attempted to make my eſcape, but in vain; the apartment was very extenſive, the houſe in a retired ſituation, the ſervants in the ſecret, and all the doors locked. I am queſtioned, and anſwer moſt of the queſtions laughing. I am received *Apprentice*, and immediately after *Fellow-craft*. Having received theſe two degrees, I was informed that a third was to be conferred on me. On this I am conducted into a large room. There the ſcene changes, and takes a more ſerious appearance. And though they diſpenſed with my undergoing all the more toilſome teſts, they nevertheleſs were not ſparing in a multitude of tireſome and inſignificant queſtions.

On finding myſelf obliged to go through this farce, I had taken care to ſay, that ſince they had

cut off every means of retreat, I was forced to ſubmit; but that, if I perceived any thing either againſt honour or conſcience, they ſhould ſoon find with whom they had to deal.

As yet I had only perceived a mere childiſh play and burleſque ceremonies, in ſpite of all the gravity which the brethren affected; but I had given no offence by any of my anſwers. At length the Venerable with the utmoſt gravity put the following queſtion: "Brother, are you diſpoſed to "execute all the orders of the Grand-Maſter, "though you were to receive contrary orders "from a King, an Emperor, or any other Sove-"reign whatever?" My anſwer was "*No.*"— "What *No,*" replies the Venerable with ſurprize! "Are you only entered among us to betray our "ſecrets! Would you heſitate between the inter-"eſts of Maſonry and thoſe of the prophane?— "You are not aware then that there is not one of "our ſwords but is ready to pierce the heart of a "traitor." Notwithſtanding the gravity with which this queſtion was put, and the menaces which accompanied it, I could not perſuade my-ſelf that he was in earneſt; but I ſtill continued to anſwer in the negative, and replied, as may eaſily be imagined, "That it was rather extraordinary "to ſuppoſe that I who had only been brought in "by force could ever have come there in order

"to

" to betray the ſecrets of Maſonry. You talk of " ſecrets, and you have told me none. If in " order to be initiated I muſt promiſe to obey a " man that I know not, and if the intereſts of " Maſonry can be a bar to any part of my duty, " good day to you Gentlemen. It is not too late " as yet. I know nothing of your myſteries, nor " do I wiſh to know more of them."

This anſwer did not diſconcert the Venerable in the leaſt, and he continued to act his part perfectly well; he preſſed me more earneſtly, and renewed his threats. I certainly believed the whole to be a farce; but even in joke I would not promiſe obedience to their Grand Maſter, eſpecially on the ſuppoſition that his commands could ever be contrary to thoſe of the Sovereign. I replied once more, " Gentlemen, or Brethren, I told you be- " fore, that if there was any thing in your games " either againſt honor or conſcience, you ſhould " learn whom you had to deal with. We are now " come to the point. You may do what you " pleaſe with me, but you ſhall never make me " aſſent to ſuch a propoſition; and once more I " ſay *No*."

Every one kept the moſt profound ſilence except the Venerable, though they were much amuſed with the ſcene. It at length grew more ſerious between the Venerable and me. He would

not give up the point, and, renewing his queſtion over and over again, he was in hopes, by tiring my patience, to extort a YES. At length I found myſelf quite wearied out. I was blindfold, I tore off the bandage, threw it upon the ground, and ſtamping with my foot, called out No, with every ſign of impatience. Immediately the whole Lodge clap their hands in ſign of applauſe, and the Venerable compliments me on my conſtancy. "Such "are the men for us, men of reſolution and cou- "rage."—What," ſaid I, "men of reſolution! "And how many do you find who reſiſt your "threats! You yourſelves, gentlemen, have not "you all ſaid YES to this queſtion: and if you "have ſaid it, how is it poſſible that you can per- "ſuade me that your myſteries contain nothing "againſt honor or conſcience."

The tone I aſſumed had thrown the Lodge into confuſion. The brethren ſurrounded me, telling me I had taken things too much in earneſt, and in too literal a ſenſe: that they never had pretended to engage in any thing contrary to the duties of every true Frenchman, and that in ſpite of all my reſiſtance I ſhould nevertheleſs be admitted. The Venerable ſoon reſtored order with a few ſtrokes of his mallet. He then informed me that I was paſſed to the degree of *Maſter*, adding, that if the ſecret was not given to me, it was only becauſe a

more

more regular lodge, and held with the ordinary ceremonies, was neceſſary on ſuch an occaſion. In the mean while he gave me the ſigns and the paſs words for the third degree, as he had done for the other two. This was ſufficient to enable me to be admitted into a regular Lodge, and now we were all brethren. As for me, I had been metamorphoſed into *apprentice*, *fellow-craft*, and *maſter* in one evening, without having ever dreamt of it in the morning.

I was too well acquainted with thoſe who had received me, not to believe their proteſtation ſincere, when they declared that they had never pretended to engage in any thing contrary to their duty. And in juſtice I am bound to declare, that, excepting the Venerable, who turned out a violent Jacobin, they all ſhowed themſelves loyal ſubjects at the Revolution. I promiſed to be preſent at a regular meeting, provided the oath was never mentioned to me. They promiſed that it never ſhould be inſiſted on, and they kept their words. They only requeſted that I would inſcribe my name on the liſt, that it might be ſent to the Grand Lodge of the Eaſt. I refuſed again, and aſked time to conſider of it; and when I had ſufficiently attended to ſee what theſe Lodges were I retired, without even conſenting to inſcribe my name.

On my firſt appearance in a regular Lodge, I was quit for a fine ſpeech on Maſonry, of which I knew but little at that time, ſo chiefly dwelt upon fraternity, and on the pleaſure of living with brethren.

They had agreed on that day to receive an apprentice, who was to have the ſecret given him with all the ordinary forms, in order that I might learn it, though only a ſpectator. It would be uſeleſs to ſwell this chapter by deſcribing the ceremonial and the trials on ſuch occaſions. In the firſt degrees, they appear to be nothing more than a childiſh play. I may refer my readers to the Key of Maſonry (La Clef de Maçons) or to the Free-maſons Catechiſm, and ſome other books of the ſort, which are perfectly exact as to the ceremonial of the three degrees which I received and ſaw conferred upon others, excepting in ſome very ſmall points of no conſequence.

The grand object for me was to learn the famous ſecret of Maſonry. The moment at length comes when the poſtulant is ordered to approach nearer to the Venerable. Then the brethren who had been armed with ſwords for the occaſion drawing up in two lines held their ſwords elevated, leaning the points toward each other, and formed what in Maſonry is called the *arch of ſteel*. The candidate paſſes under this arch to a ſort of altar elevated

elevated on two ſteps, at the fartheſt end of the Lodge. The Maſter, ſeated in an arm chair, or a ſort of throne, behind this altar, pronounced a long diſcourſe on the inviolability of the ſecret which was to be imparted, and on the danger of breaking the oath which the candidate was going to take. He pointed to the naked ſwords which were always ready to pierce the breaſt of the traitor, and declared to him that it was impoſſible to eſcape their vengeance. The candidate then ſwears, "that rather than betray the ſecret, he conſents "to have his head cut off, his heart and entrails "torn out, and his aſhes caſt before the wind." Having taken the oath the Maſter ſaid the following words to him, which the reader may eaſily conceive have not eſcaped my memory, as I had expected them with ſo much impatience, "My dear "brother, the ſecret of Maſonry conſiſts in theſe "words, EQUALITY AND LIBERTY; *all men are* "*equal and free; all men are brethren.*" The Maſter did not utter another ſyllable, and every body embraced the new *brother equal and free.* The Lodge broke up, and we gayly adjourned to a Maſonic repaſt.

I was ſo far from ſuſpecting any further meaning in this famous ſecret, that I could ſcarcely refrain from burſting into a fit of laughter on hearing it, and with the greateſt ſimplicity told thoſe who had

introduced me, If that was all their ſecret, I had known it a long time.

And certainly there was no occaſion for being a maſon to learn that man is not born for ſlavery, but to enjoy a *true Liberty* under the empire of the laws; or if they underſtand *by Equality* that as we are the children of one common parent, the creatures of the ſame God, we are to love and help each other as brethren; ſuch truths certainly are better taught in the Goſpel than by the childiſh rites of Maſonry. I muſt ſay, that though the Lodge was numerouſly attended, I did not ſee a ſingle craftſman who gave any other interpretation to this famous ſecret. The reader will ſee that it was neceſſary to go through many other degrees before they were initiated into a very different Liberty and Equality, and even that many who roſe to higher degrees were never initiated into the ultimate ſenſe of their famous ſecret.

Let not people be ſurprized that Engliſh Maſonry ſhould be chiefly compoſed of good and loyal ſubjects, whoſe main object is mutually to help each other on the principles of Equality, which with them is nothing more than Fraternity. Few Engliſh craftſmen are acquainted with more than the three firſt degrees already mentioned; and the reader may reſt aſſured, that with the exception of the imprudent queſtion on obedience to the Grand

Grand Maſter of the Order, there is nothing which can render the ſecret dangerous, were it not for the Jacobin interpretation. The Engliſh good ſenſe has baniſhed ſuch an explanation. I have even heard of a reſolution taken by ſome of the chief craftſmen, of rejecting all thoſe who might ſeek to introduce the revolutionary liberty among them. I have read moſt excellent diſcourſes and lectures on the avoiding of abuſes, in the hiſtory of their Maſonry. I have there ſeen the Grand Maſter telling the brethren that the true Equality of the craft, does not authorize the brother when out of the Lodge to derogate from that reſpect and deference due to the rank which any perſon bears in the world, or their different political degrees and titles. I have alſo remarked in the ſecret inſtructions of the Grand Maſter many excellent lectures to conciliate the Liberty and Equality of the craft, with fidelity and ſubmiſſion to the laws, in ſhort, with all the duties of a loyal ſubject *. Hence it ariſes, that though the Engliſh have every thing in common with the craft of other nations, as far as the degree of Maſter inclusive; though they have the ſame ſecret, the ſame word, and the ſame ſigns to know each other by, yet as they generally ſtop at this degree, they never are ini-

* See the 1ſt part of the Hiſtory of Engliſh Maſonry.

tiated

tiated into the grand myſteries; or we ſhould perhaps be more correct, if we ſaid they had rejected them. They have found means of purifying Maſonry. We ſhall ſoon ſee how little theſe grand myſteries could agree with the character of a nation which has given ſo many proofs of its wiſdom.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of the Grand Myſteries or Secrets of the Occult Lodges.

WE comprehend under the deſignation of Occult Lodges, or the higher degrees of Maſonry, all Free-maſons in general who, after having paſt the firſt three degrees of *Apprentice*, *Fellowcraft*, and *Maſter*, ſhow ſufficient zeal to be admitted into the higher degrees, where the veil is rent aſunder, where emblematical and allegorical figures are thrown aſide, and where the twofold principle of Liberty and Equality is unequivocally explained *by war againſt Chriſt and his Altars, war againſt Kings and their Thrones!!!* In demonſtrating that ſuch is the reſult of the grand myſteries of the Craft, it will not be the want, but the multiplicity of proofs that will embarraſs us. Theſe alone would fill a large volume, and we wiſh to comprize them in this chapter. The reader will at leaſt diſpenſe with the emblems, oaths, ceremonies, and trials which are peculiar to each of theſe higher degrees. To ſhow their laſt object and to develop their doctrine is the eſſential point, and what we ſhall always have in view. We ſhall begin by general

Object of theſe myſteries.

general obſervations, which will enable the reader to follow theſe myſteries more accurately, according as they are explained.

General reaſons for miſtruſting theſe myſteries.

Notwithſtanding that in the firſt degrees of Maſonry every thing appears to partake of puerile inventions, they nevertheleſs contain many things which the ſect have thrown out, merely to obſerve the impreſſion which they made on the young adepts, and to judge from thence to what lengths they may be led.

1ſt. It declares the grand object it has in view to be at one time, *the raiſing of temples to virtue, and the excavating of dungeons for vice*; at another, to bring the adepts *to light*, and deliver them from the darkneſs with which the *prophane* are encompaſſed; and by the *prophane* are underſtood the remainder of the univerſe. This promiſe is contained in the firſt Catechiſm of the Craft, and none will deny it. Nevertheleſs, this promiſe alone ſufficiently indicates that the Craft acknowledge a morality and teach a doctrine which brands Chriſt and his Goſpel with error and darkneſs.

2dly. The Maſonic and Chriſtian æra do not coincide. *The year of Light* dates with them from the firſt days of the creation: This again is what no Maſon will deny. But that cuſtom clearly demonſtrates that their *lights*, their *morality*, and their *religious doctrines*, are anterior to the Evangelical

gelical Revelation, or even to Moſes and the Prophets; they will, in ſhort, be whatever incredulity may pleaſe to ſtyle the Religion of Nature.

3dly. In the Maſonic language, all their Lodges are but one temple repreſenting the whole univerſe; the temple which extends from the *Eaſt to the Weſt, from the South to the North.* They admit into this temple with equal indifference the Chriſtian or the Jew, the Turk or the Idolater, in fine, without diſtinction of ſect or religion. All equally behold the *light*, all learn the ſcience of virtue, of real happineſs, and all may remain members of the Craft, and riſe in its degrees up to that where they are taught that all religious tenets are but errors and prejudices. Though many Maſons may view this re-union in no other light than that of univerſal charity and benevolence, which ought to extend to all mankind, whether Jew, Gentile, Idolater, or Chriſtian, it is nevertheleſs much to be feared, that this re-union of error and falſehood only tends to infuſe an indifference for all religious tenets into the minds of the adepts, as a preparatory ſtep to the denial of all in the higher degrees.

4thly. It is always under the moſt dreadful oaths of ſecrecy, that the Free-maſons communicate their pretended lights or their art of building temples to virtue, and dungeons for vice. When both truth and virtue had every thing to fear from the reign-

ing

Object of the myſteries proved by the nature of the degrees.

ing tyrants, it may be conceived that they taught their leſſons in private; but, ſo far from exacting an oath of ſecrecy, they condemned ſilence as criminal when their leſſons could be made public, and commanded that what had been learned under the ſhadow of the night ſhould be preached openly at noon day. Either the doctrines of the Craft are conformable to the laws of Chriſtianity, to the peace of ſtates, and conducive to virtue and happineſs (and then what has it had to fear from Kings and Pontiffs ſince Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed)? Or, their pretended ſcience is in oppoſition to the religion and the laws of the Chriſtian world (and then we have only to ſay, that the evil doer ſeeks to hide himſelf).

5thly. Moſt certainly the Free-maſons do not make a ſecret of what is praiſe-worthy in their aſſociations. It is not that fraternal affection for their neighbour which they hide, and which they only have in common with every religious obſervet of the goſpel. Neither do they make a ſecret of the ſweets of that convivial Equality which accompanies their meetings and their fraternal repaſts. On the contrary, they are perpetually extolling their benevolence, and nobody is ignorant of the conviviality of their regales. Their ſecret muſt therefore contain ſomething widely different from this fraternity, and ſomething leſs innocent than the mirth of the Maſonic table.

Such

Such language in general might have been held to all Maſons; ſuch reaſonings might have made them ſuſpect that the higher degrees of their aſſociation contained myſteries which it was far more intereſted in hiding, than their fraternity, their ſigns, and paſs-words. That affected ſecrecy on the firſt principles of Maſonry, *Liberty* and *Equality*, the oath never to reveal that ſuch was the baſis of their doctrines, premiſed that there exiſted ſuch an explanation of theſe words as the ſect was intereſted in hiding both from the ſtate and church. And in reality it was to attain to this explanation of the laſt myſteries that ſo many trials, oaths, and degrees were neceſſary.

To convince the reader how much theſe ſurmizes are realized in the Occult Lodges, it is neceſſary for us to go back to the degree of Maſter, and relate the allegorical ſtory of which the ſucceſſive explanations and interpretations form the profound myſteries of the higher degrees.

In this degree of Maſter-maſon the Lodge is hung round with black. In the middle is a coffin covered with a pall: the brethren ſtanding round it in attitudes denoting ſorrow and revenge. When the new adept is admitted, the Maſter relates to him the following hiſtory or fable.

" Adoniram preſided over the payment of the workmen who were building the temple by Solomon's orders. They were three thouſand workmen.

Allegorical hiſtory of Adoniram, the foundation of all theſe degrees.

men. That each one might receive his due, Adoniram divided them into three claſſes, Apprentices, Fellow-crafts, and Maſters. He entruſted each claſs with a word, ſigns, and a gripe, by which they might be recognized. Each claſs was to preſerve the greateſt ſecrecy as to theſe ſigns and words. Three of the Fellow-crafts, wiſhing to know the word, and by that means obtain the ſalary, of Maſter, hid themſelves in the temple, and each poſted himſelf at a different gate. At the uſual time when Adoniram came to ſhut the gates of the temple, the firſt of the three met him, and demanded the *word of the maſters*; Adoniram refuſed to give it, and received a violent blow with a ſtick on his head. He flies to another gate, is met, challenged, and treated in a ſimilar manner by the ſecond: flying to the third door he is killed by the Fellow-craft poſted there, on his refuſing to betray the word. His aſſaſſins buried him under a heap of rubbiſh, and marked the ſpot with a branch of Acacia.

Adoniram's abſence gave great uneaſineſs to Solomon and the Maſters. He is ſought for every where: at length one of the Maſters diſcovers the corpſe, and, taking it by the finger, the finger parted from the hand; he took it by the wriſt, and it parted from the arm; when the Maſter, in aſtoniſhment, cried out *Mac Benac*, which the Craft interprets by "*the fleſh parts from the bones.*"

Left

Leſt Adoniram ſhould have revealed the *word*, the Maſters convened and agreed to change it, and to ſubſtitute the words *Mac Benac*; ſacred words, that Free-maſons dare not pronounce out of the Lodges, and there each only pronounces one ſyllable, leaving his neighbour to pronounce the other.

The hiſtory finiſhed, the adept is informed, that the object of the degree he has juſt received is to recover the word loſt by the death of Adoniram, and to revenge this martyr of the Maſonic ſecrecy*. The generality of Maſons, looking upon this hiſtory as no more than a fable, and the ceremonies as puerile, give themſelves very little trouble in ſearching farther into theſe myſteries.

Theſe ſports, however, aſſume a more ſerious aſpect when we arrive at the degree of Elect *(Elu)*. This degree is ſubdivided into two parts; the firſt has the revenging of Adoniram for its object, the other to recover the *word*, or rather the ſacred doctrine which it expreſſed, and which has been loſt. Degree of Elect.

In this degree of Elect, all the brethren appear dreſſed in black, wearing a breaſt-piece on the left ſide, on which is embroidered a death's head, a bone, and a poniard, encircled by the motto of *Conquer or die*. The ſame motto is embroidered on 1ſt Part.

* See the degree of Maſter in the Works on Maſonry.

a ribband which they wear in ſaltier. Every thing breathes death and revenge. The candidate is led into the Lodge blind-folded, with bloody gloves on his hands. An adept with a poniard in his hand threatens to run him through the heart for the crime with which he is accuſed. After various frights, he obtains his life, on condition that he will revenge the father of Maſonry in the death of his aſſaſſin. He is ſhown to a dark cavern. He is to penetrate into it, and they call to him, Strike all that ſhall oppoſe you; enter, defend yourſelf, and avenge our Maſter; at that price you ſhall receive the degree of Elect. A poniard in his right hand, a lamp in his left, he proceeds; a phantom oppoſes his paſſage, he hears the ſame voice repeat, Strike, avenge Hiram, there is his aſſaſſin. He ſtrikes and the blood flows.—Strike off his head the voice repeats, and the head of the corpſe is lying at his feet. He ſeizes it by the hair*, and triumphantly carries it back as a proof of his victory; ſhows it to each of the brethren, and is judged worthy of the new degree.

I have queſtioned divers Maſons whether this apprenticeſhip to ferocity and murder had never given them the idea, that the head to be cut off was that of Kings, and they candidly owned that

* The reader may eaſily conceive, that this corpſe is no more than a mannikin containing bladders full of blood.

the

the idea had never ſtruck them until the Revolution had convinced them of the fact.

It was the ſame with reſpect to the religious part of this degree, where the adept is at once Pontiff and Sacrificer with the reſt of the brethren. Veſted in the ornaments of the prieſthood, they offer bread and wine, according to the order of Melchiſedec. The ſecret object of this ceremony is to re-eſtabliſh religious Equality, and to exhibit all men equally Prieſts and Pontiffs, to recall the brethren to natural religion, and to perſuade them that the religion of Moſes and of Chriſt had violated religious Liberty and Equality by the diſtinction of Prieſts and Laity. It was the Revolution again which opened the eyes of many of the adepts, who then owned that they had been dupes to this impiety, as they had been to the regicide eſſay in the former part *. 2d Part.

Theſe

* Were we leſs rigorous as to our proofs, we ſhould treat in this place of the degree called the *Knights of the Sun*. But we are only acquainted with it through the medium of the *Voile Levé (the veil raiſed up)* a work of the Abbé Le Franc, certainly a man of the greateſt virtue and undoubted veracity, and one of thoſe excellent Eccleſiaſtics who preferred falling under the butchering poniards of the Septembrizers, to betraying their religion. But this author has neglected to inform us from what ſources he had drawn his documents on the Maſonic degrees. Beſide, we can remark, that he was not ſufficiently acquainted with the origin of Maſonry, which he

The higher degrees of Scotch Maſonry.

Theſe myſteries are not ſufficiently explained in the degree of Elect for all to comprehend them. The generality of Maſons initiated in this degree give

only traces back to Socinus: His knowledge alſo of the Scotch degrees appears to have been acquired from inaccurate tranſlations, which our French authors had vitiated according to their reſpective purpoſes.

On the other ſide, we know for certain, that this degree of *Knight of the Sun* is a modern creation. Its author is to be known by his Teutonic ſtyle. If we are to believe what we have been told, it owes its origin to one of thoſe Philoſophiſts of very high life, who was too much attached to the high rank which he enjoyed, to adopt any other Equality than that which applied to the Maſonic feaſts and their impiety. And nothing is to be found in this degree which militates againſt the throne. It is much too perſpicuous for many Maſons, who would have been diſguſted with any thing but emblematical figures ſuſceptible of various explanations. Nevertheleſs, we were acquainted with ſeveral of theſe *Knights of the Sun* in France. This degree was only given to ſuch of the adepts whoſe impiety was unequivocal. It was rather a degree of modern Philoſophiſm than of ancient Maſonry. Under that point of view it is worthy of notice; but we only give the following account as an extract from the Abbé Le Franc's work.

When initiated into this higher degree, it was no longer poſſible for the adept to diſſemble with himſelf how incompatible the Maſonic code was with the ſlighteſt remnant of Chriſtianity. Here the Maſter of the Lodge is ſtyled *Adam*, whilſt the introducer takes the name of *Veritas (Truth)*. The following are part of the lectures which brother *Veritas* repeats to

give themſelves little trouble to underſtand the real ſignification of them; and as long as they have any ſentiments of religion or attachment to their Prince,

to the new adept while recapitulating all the allegories which he has ſeen in the former parts of Maſonry.

" Learn, in the firſt place that the three implements with " which you have been made acquainted—the Bible, the " Compaſſes, and the Square, have a ſecret ſignification un- " known to you. By the Bible you are to underſtand that " you are to acknowledge no other law than that of Adam, " the law which the Almighty had engraved on his heart, " and *that is what is called the* LAW OF NATURE.—The " Compaſs recalls to your mind, that God is the central " point of every thing, from which every thing is equally " diſtant, and to which every thing is equally near.—By the " Square we learn, that God has made every *thing equal*— " The Cubic Stone, that *all your actions are equal with reſpect* " *to the ſovereign good*.—The death of Hiram, and the change " of the Maſter's word, teach you, that it is difficult to eſcape " the ſnares of ignorance, but that it is your duty to ſhow " the ſame courage as our Maſter Hiram, who ſuffered him- " ſelf to be maſſacred rather than hearken to the perſuaſions " of his aſſaſſins."

The moſt eſſential part of this diſcourſe is the explanation which Brother *Veritas* gives of the degree of Elect. Amongſt others we read the following lines:

" If you aſk me what are the neceſſary qualities to enable " a Maſon to arrive at the centre of real perfection? I ſhall " anſwer, that in order to attain it, he muſt have cruſhed " the head of the ſerpent of worldly ignorance, and have " *caſt off* thoſe prejudices of youth concerning the myſteries " of the predominant religion of his native country. *All*

Prince, they reject with indignation all interpretations which militate againſt either. Many of them are diſguſted with the multiplicity of trials, and

" *religious worſhip being only invented, in hopes of acquiring* " *power, and to gain precedency among men; and by a ſloth* " *which covets, under the falſe pretence of piety, its neighbour's* " *riches*; in fine, by Gluttony, the daughter of Hypocriſy, " who, ſtraining every nerve to reſtrain the carnal ſenſes of " thoſe who poſſeſs riches, perpetually offer to them on the " altar of their hearts, holocauſts which voluptuouſneſs, lux- " ury, and perjury, have procured for them. This, my " dear brother, is what you have to combat, ſuch is the " monſter you have to cruſh under the emblem of the ſerpent. " *It is a faithful repreſentation of that which the ignorant vulgar* " *adore under the name of religion.*

" It was the prophane and timid Abiram who, transformed " by *a fanatic zeal into a tool of the Monkiſh and religious rites,* " ſtruck the firſt blows on the breaſt of our father Hiram; " that is to ſay, who ſapped the foundations of the celeſtial " temple, which the ETERNAL had himſelf erected upon " earth to ſublime virtue.

" The firſt age of the world witneſſed what I aſſert. *The* " *moſt ſimple law of nature* rendered our firſt fathers the hap- " pieſt of mortals. The monſter Pride appears on earth, he " bellows, he is heard by men and by the happy mortals of " thoſe days. He promiſes them happineſs in another life, " and perſuades them by his melliſluous words, that he *taught* " *men to adore the Eternal Creator of all things in a more exten-* " *ſive and more ſpecial manner* than any perſon had done before " on earth. *This hydra* with an hundred heads miſled and " miſleads thoſe men who are ſubject to its laws, and will " continue its deceptions until the moment when the true

" *Elect*

and are content to remain in the inferior degrees, which ſuffice to give them the title of Maſons, admit them to all the Maſonic repaſts, and even entitle them to the alms and benefactions which the Lodges beſtow on their indigent brethren.—Thoſe whoſe zeal is not cooled by this multiplicity of trials are generally admitted from the degree of *Maſter*, or from that of *Elect*, to the three Scotch degrees. We ſhall not ſeek for the hiſtory and tendency of theſe three degrees in books which have been written to diſcredit the craft. The German adept who tranſlated them into his language for the inſtruction of his brethren, is one of the moſt zealous knights for the doctrine therein contained. His whole genius is exerted in their defence, nor could we follow a more unexceptionable author. His object was to infuſe light into his brethren; and we prophane beings may draw the following concluſions from his lectures *.

Every Maſon who wiſhes to be admitted into the Scotch degrees, and even into all other degrees of Maſonry, is firſt taught that until that period he has lived in ſlavery, and it is on that account only that he is admitted into the preſence

" *Elect* ſhall appear to combat and cruſh it entirely." (*See the degree of Knights of the Sun*). Such doctrines need no comment.

* See the Scotch degrees printed at Stockholm, 1784.

of the other brethren with a rope about his neck, praying that he may be delivered from his bonds. But when he aſpires at the third Scotch degree, or at becoming a knight of St. Andrew, he muſt appear in a far more humiliating coſtume. The candidate is ſhut up in a dark cell, a rope with four ſlip knots is twiſted round his neck, he is ſtretched out upon the floor; there, by the dull light of a twinkling lamp, he is abandoned to himſelf to meditate on the wretched ſtate of ſlavery in which he exiſts, and to learn properly to eſtimate the value of Liberty. At length one of the brethren comes and introduces him to the Lodge, leading him by the rope, holding a drawn ſword in his right hand as if meant to run him through the heart, in caſe he made any reſiſtance. After having undergone a long examination, and particularly after having ſworn on the ſalvation of his ſoul, never to reveal the ſecrets with which he is entruſted, he is declared free. It would be uſeleſs to enumerate all the different oaths; it is ſufficient to ſay, that each degree and ſubdiviſion of degree, has its peculiar oath, and that they are all frightful; all call the vengeance of God and of the Brotherhood on the unhappy man who ſhall betray their ſecret. In future then we ſhall only treat of the doctrine of theſe ſecrets.

In the firſt degree of Scotch Knighthood the adept is informed, that he has been elevated to the dignity

dignity of *High Prieſt*. He receives a ſort of benediction in the name of *the immortal and inviſible Jehovah*, and in future it is under that title that he is to adore the Deity, *becauſe* the ſignification of JEHOVAH *is far more expreſſive than that of* ADONAI.

In this firſt degree he receives the Maſonic ſcience only as deſcending from Solomon and Hiram, and revived by the Knights Templars.—But in the ſecond degree he learns that it is to be traced to Adam himſelf, and has been handed down by Noah, Nimrod, Solomon, Hugo de Paganis, the founder of the Knights Templars, and Jaques de Molay, their laſt Grand Maſter, who each in their turns had been the favourites of *Jehovah*, and are ſtyled the Maſonic Sages. At length in the third degree it is revealed to him, that the celebrated *word* loſt by the death of Hiram was this name of Jehovah. It was found, he is told, by the Knights Templars at the time when the Chriſtians were building a Church at Jeruſalem. In digging the foundations in that part on which the holy of holies of Solomon's temple formerly ſtood, they diſcovered three ſtones, which had formerly been parts of the foundation. The form and junction of theſe three ſtones drew the attention of the Templars; and their aſtoniſhment was extreme, when they beheld the name of Jehovah engraved on the laſt. This was the famous

mous word loſt by the death of Adoniram. The Knights Templars, on their return to Europe, took great care not to loſe ſo precious a monument. They carried them into Scotland, taking particular care of that which bore the name of Jehovah. The Scotch ſages on their part were not forgetful of the reſpect due to ſuch precious monuments, they made them the foundation ſtones of their firſt Lodge; and as theſe firſt ſtones were laid on St. Andrew's day, they took the name of Knights of St. Andrew. Their ſucceſſors are entruſted with the ſecret, and are at this day the perfect maſters of Freemaſonry, the High Prieſts of Jehovah.

If we lay aſide the hermetical part of the ſcience, or the tranſmutation of metals, ſuch will be in ſubſtance the whole doctrine which is revealed to the adept initiated in the grand myſteries of the Scotch degrees.

In a ſort of Cathechiſm, to which he anſwers to ſhow that he has remembered every thing that he has ſeen, and all that has been explained to him in the Lodge, or, as it is then called, in Solomon's temple, the following queſtion is aſked, *Is that all you have ſeen?* To which he anſwers, *I have ſeen many other things, but, like the other Scotch Maſters, I keep them ſecret in my heart.* This ſecret henceforth cannot be difficult to underſtand. It is only to view the *Scotch Maſter* in his new character of

High

High Prieſt of Jehovah, or of that worſhip, that pretended Deiſm, which we have been told was ſucceſſively the religion of Adam, Noah, Nimrod, Solomon, Hugo de Paganis, of the Grand Maſter Molay, and of the Knights Templars, and which at this day is to conſtitute the religion of the complete Maſter Maſon.

Theſe myſteries might have ſufficed for the adepts. All who had obtained the Scotch degrees were declared free in future, and all were equally Prieſts of Jehovah. This prieſthood ridded them of all the myſteries of the Goſpel, and of all revealed religion. That liberty and happineſs which the ſect declares to conſiſt in the revival of Deiſm, ſufficiently inſtils into the mind of the adept what he is to think of Chriſtianity and of its divine Author. Nevertheleſs the grand myſteries are not exhauſted. The adepts ſtill have to diſcover who was the perſon that wreſted the *word*, the famous name of *Jehovah*, from their predeceſſors; that is to ſay, who it was that deſtroyed their favourite worſhip of Deiſm. It was but too evident that the whole fable of Hiram or Adoniram and of his aſſaſſins was no more than an allegory, the explanation of which muſt naturally anſwer the queſtions, who is the real aſſaſſin of Adoniram? By whom was the Deiſtical form of worſhip deſtroyed? Who was it that wreſted the famous word from the ſect? He is the perſon againſt whom the vengeance

geance and the hatred of the ſect is directed, and it was neceſſary to inſtil the ſame ſpirit into the minds of its profound adepts. To effectuate this, we aſcend to a new degree called the Knights *Roſæ Crucis*, or the Roſicrucians.

It is certainly a moſt atrocious blaſphemy to accuſe Chriſt of having deſtroyed by his religion the doctrine of the unity of God; when on the contrary the moſt evident and the moſt atteſted of all facts is, that to his religion we owe the baniſhment of thouſands and thouſands of falſe gods, which the Idolators had made to themſelves. The goſpel, in declaring the unity of God, teaches us the Trinity of Perſons; but this myſtery like all others which we learn from revelation, humbles the Sophiſters in their own minds. Fraught with ingratitude againſt him who has caſt the idols on the duſt, they have ſworn an eternal hatred againſt the eternal Word, becauſe he reveals a God whom in their madneſs they are not able to comprehend. *Chriſt himſelf* in their eyes is the deſtroyer of the unity of God, he is the great enemy of *Jehovah*; and to infuſe the hatred of the ſect into the minds of the new adepts, conſtitutes the grand myſtery of the new degree which they have called Roſicrucian.

Degree of Roſæ Crucis.

As the adept was ſeldom initiated into this new degree before he had paſſed through the Scotch degrees, he is already aware, as the reader muſt obſerve, that *Jehovah* is no longer the word

ſought

ſought after, and here we ſhall ſee every thing relate only to the author of Chriſtianity. The ornaments of the Lodge appear to be ſolely intended to recal to the candidate the ſolemn myſtery of Mount Calvary. The whole is hung in black, an altar is to be ſeen at the bottom, and over the altar is a tranſparent repreſentation of the three croſſes, the middle one bearing the ordinary inſcription.—The brethren in ſacerdotal veſtments are ſeated on the ground, in the moſt profound ſilence, ſorrowful and afflicted, reſting their heads on their arm to repreſent their grief. It is not the death of the ſon of God, who died victim of our ſins, that is the cauſe of their affliction, the grand object of it is evident by the firſt anſwer which is made to the queſtion with which all Lodges are generally opened.

The maſter aſks the Senior Warden what o'clock it is? The anſwer varies according to the different degrees. In this it is as follows: "It is the firſt "hour of the day, the time when the veil of the "temple was rent aſunder, when darkneſs and "conſternation was ſpread over the earth, when "the light was darkened, when *the implements of* "*Maſonry were broken*, when the flaming ſtar diſ-"appeared, when the cubic ſtone was broken, "*when the word was loſt* *."

* See the degree Roſæ Crucis.

The

The adept who has attended to the progreſſive diſcoveries he has made in the different degrees, needs no further leſſons to underſtand the meaning of this anſwer. He thereby learns that the day on which the *word* JEHOVAH was loſt is preciſely that on which the Son of God dying on a croſs for the ſalvation of mankind conſummated the grand myſtery of our Religion, deſtroying the reign of every other, whether Judaic, natural, or ſophiſtical.—The more a Maſon is attached to the *word*, that is, to his pretended natural Religion, the more inveterate will his hatred be againſt the author of revealed religion.

Neither is this *word*, which he has already found, any longer the object of his reſearches; his hatred has further views. He muſt ſeek for a new word, which ſhall perpetuate in his own mind and that of his brethren their blaſphemous hatred for the God of Chriſtianity; and for this they adopt the inſcription of the croſs.

Every Chriſtian knows the ſignification of INRI, *Ieſus Nazarenus Rex Iudæorum* (Jeſus of Nazareth King of the Jews). The Roſicrucian is taught the following interpretation—the *Iew* of *Nazareth* led by *Raphael* into *Iudea*; an interpretation which, diveſting Chriſt of his divinity, aſſimilates him to a common man, whom the Jew Raphael conducts to Jeruſalem there to ſuffer condign puniſhment for his crimes. As ſoon as the Candidate has proved

proved that he underſtands the Maſonic meaning of this inſcription INRI, the Maſter exclaims, *My dear Brethren the word is found again*, and all preſent applaud this luminous diſcovery, that HE whoſe death was the conſummation and the grand myſtery of the Chriſtian Religion was no more than a common Jew crucified for his crimes.

It is thus that the ſect have blaſphemouſly adopted the very word, which recals to the Chriſtian all that love which he bears for the Son of God expiring on the croſs for the ſalvation of mankind, as their watch-word of hatred. They repeat it to each other when they meet, and INRI is to perpetuate their ſpite againſt him who loved them even unto the death of the croſs.

It is not on the authority of perſons ſtrangers to the craft that we have diſcloſed this atrocious myſtery of Occult Maſonry. What I have already ſaid reſpecting my initiation to the firſt degrees put me in the way of converſing with thoſe whom I knew to be more advanced, and in many of theſe interviews it happened, that, notwithſtanding all their ſecrecy, ſome unguarded expreſſions eſcaped the moſt zealous adepts, which threw light on the ſubject. Others lent me their books, preſuming that their obſcureneſs and the want of the eſſential words, or the method of diſcovering them, would baffle all my attempts to underſtand them. I nevertheleſs diſcovered ſome of theſe words, ſuch as *Jehovah*,

vab, by uniting ſeveral pages and only taking the bottom letter of each. This famous word diſcovered, I ſoon got knowledge of that of *Inri*. I then combined all I had ſeen, all that I knew of the different degrees, with what I had collected from divers converſations I had had with certain Maſons, whoſe Philoſophiſm was otherwiſe known to me. I afterwards converſed with the moſt candid men whom I knew to be in the ſame degrees. I reprobated particularly thoſe ceremonies ſo evidently in deriſion of Religion, and which they had never beheld but as games without any object. I never met with one who denied the facts as I have ſtated them. They owned the different reading of the word *Inri* in the degree Roſæ Crucis, but they denied the moſt diſtant idea of the conſequences which I had drawn. Some, on reflection, acknowledged them to be well-founded, while others conſidered them as vaſtly exaggerated.

At the time when the Revolution took place, I combined my preceding diſcoveries, the decrees of the National Aſſembly, and the ſecret of the firſt degree, and no longer doubted that Maſonry was but a ſociety formed by men who, on the firſt initiation of their adepts, gave them the words Liberty and Equality as their ſecret, leaving to well-meaning and religious Maſons to interpret them according to their own principles; yet reſerving to themſelves to interpret (in their Occult degrees)

degrees) theſe ſame words according to the full extent of the French Revolution.

One of theſe Brethren, who had long ſince been admitted to the degree of Roſæ Crucis, but who was at the ſame time a very virtuous and religious man, was much concerned at ſeeing me in this opinion. He tried every means to give me a better idea of a ſociety in which he was proud of having filled the moſt honorable poſts. This was a topic on which we had often converſed; and he wiſhed much to make me a convert to Maſonry. He was indeed almoſt affronted with me for ſaying that he was not initiated into all the myſteries of Maſonry, though a Roſicrucian, or elſe that this degree had its ſubdiviſions, and that he was only partially acquainted with them. At length I convinced him of the fact, by aſking the explanation of ſome of the Maſonic *Hieroglyphics*; he owned that he had aſked their meaning, but the explanation of them had been refuſed him; yet he had no doubt of their being as innocent emblems as the Square, the Compaſs, the Trowel, and many others. I knew that he had but one degree more to take, and the veil would be rent aſunder. I propoſed or rather marked out the means by which he might acquire that degree; and then, I told him, all illuſion as to the real object of the Occult Maſons would vaniſh. He was too eager for being initiated not to make a trial of the means I

propoſed; but he was convinced that it would prove ineffectual, and only furniſh him with new arms to combat my unjuſt prejudices againſt Maſonry. A few days after I ſaw him enter my room; but in ſuch a ſtate of agitation, that his lips could ſcarcely utter, "O my dear friend, my dear "friend—you were in the right—Oh, how much "you were in the right! ... Where have I been? "My God! where have I been?"—I eaſily underſtood theſe exclamations; but the poor man could ſcarcely recover himſelf ſo as to continue. He threw himſelf into a chair as if he were exhauſted, perpetually repeating, "Where have I "been?—Oh how much you are in the right!"—I earneſtly deſired him to give me ſome particulars with which I was unacquainted—"Oh how "much you were in the right!" he repeated again; "but that is all I can tell you."—"Oh, "unhappy man," I exclaimed, "you have then "taken that execrable oath, and I am the perſon "who has expoſed you to that raſh deed; I ſincerely aſk your pardon, but I proteſt upon my "word, that I never reflected on that execrable "oath when I ſuggeſted the means by which you "might convince yourſelf, and learn to know "thoſe deteſted beings who have ſo horribly "abuſed your credulity. I know that it had been "better for you to have been for ever ignorant "of that fatal ſecret, than that you ſhould learn "it at the expence of ſo horrid an oath. I really

"did

" did not reflect on it, or I ſhould never have ex-
" poſed you to it; no, I could not in conſcience."
It was really true, that I never had reflected on this oath. Without examining whether ſuch wicked oaths are binding, I feared being indiſcreet. But it had been ſufficient for me to have ſhown this gentleman that I was acquainted, at leaſt in part, with theſe Occult myſteries. He ſaw clearly by my queſtions, that he had taught me nothing new by an avowal which alone proves the very eſſence of theſe Occult degrees.

His fortune had been ruined by the Revolution; and he declared to me, that it would from that moment be retrieved, provided he accepted of a propoſal which had been made to him.—" If I
" chuſe," ſaid he, " to go to London, Bruxelles,
" Conſtantinople, or any other town I pleaſe,
" neither I, my wife, nor my children, will ever
" want for any thing."—" Yes," I replied, " but
" on condition only that you go there *to preach*
" *Liberty and Equality; in ſhort, all the horrors of*
" *the Revolution.*"—" *You are right,*" replied he,
" *but that is all I can ſay*—Oh, my God, where
" have I been!—I beg you will not queſtion me
" any farther."

This was ſufficient for my preſent purpoſe; but I hoped in time to learn farther particulars. Nor were my hopes vain. The following is what I have gathered from various Maſons, who, finding

me acquainted with the major part of their ſecrets, ſpoke the more openly to me, till at length, feeling how much they had been duped by this Occult ſect, they would willingly have revealed all its myſteries, could they have done it without expoſing themſelves to danger.

Myſtical Maſonry.

The explanation which was given to an adept of all that he had ſeen before on his admiſſion to the degree of Roſæ Crucis, depended entirely on the diſpoſition they obſerved in him. If they had to do with a man who was proof againſt their impiety, they ſought to divert him from the Church under pretence of regenerating his faith; they repreſented to him, that there exiſted an infinity of abuſes in Chriſtianity at preſent, with reſpect to the Liberty and Equality of the children of God. With them, the word to be recovered was, a wiſh for a Revolution which ſhould revive thoſe times when every thing was common among Chriſtians, when the diſtinctions of rich, of poor, or of high and mighty Lords, were unknown. They were taught to look forward to the moſt happy regeneration of mankind, and almoſt to a new heaven and a new earth. Credulous and ſimple minds were caught by ſuch magnificent promiſes. They looked upon the Revolution as that ſacred fire which was to purify the earth; and theſe credulous adepts were ſeen to ſecond the Revolution with the enthuſiaſtic zeal of a holy cauſe.

This

This may be called *Myſtical Maſonry*. Such was the craft of all thoſe fools for whom the Occult Maſons ſet up the Propheteſs La Brouſſe, ſo famous in the beginning of the Revolution. * Such again was that of the weak-minded Varlet, the Biſhop *in partibus* of Babylon. I never could conceive where he had gathered his religious opinions, when with the greateſt ſimplicity he complained that I had combated them. I was informed of it by a gueſt of his, whoſe reputation of great knowledge in Maſonry had acquired him a ſeat at the Maſonic repaſts which the poor ſimple man uſed to give; and even at thoſe dinners the difference was obſervable in the adepts, though of the ſame degree, each having received an explanation of the myſteries coinciding with his own diſpoſition. Our ſimple Biſhop viewed the whole ſcience of the Craft in no other light than as the perfection of the Goſpel; and even in his repaſts he was ever mindful of the precepts of the Church, keeping abſtinence on days appointed, &c. The Apoſtate Dom Gerles, on the contrary, was a Maſon of a quite different ſyſtem or explanation. He already ſung thoſe verſes which in a letter ſince found among Robeſpierre's papers *, he declares to have addreſſed to truth alone:

* Proces Verbal, No. 57.

Ni Culte, ni Pretres, ni Roi,
Car la Nouvelle Eve, c'eſt toi *.

It was at theſe repaſts that the Doctor La Mothe, a learned Roſicrucian, behaved with a modeſty which ſeemed to prognoſticate that one day he would equally hate both the craft of Varlet and of Dom Gerles. The latter paid his revolutionary debt to the guillotine; the other two are living, and I name them becauſe I am not afraid of being contradicted, and becauſe theſe ſorts of anecdotes carry ſtrong proof with them, and explain how perſons of the moſt pious and charitable diſpoſitions have been miſled: how a Princeſs, the ſiſter of the Duke of Orleans, was ſo blinded as even to pant after the Revolution, which in her eyes was to be nothing leſs than the regeneration of the Chriſtian world †.

* Nor Worſhip, nor Prieſts, nor King, for thou art the new Eve.

† The art ſhown in this degree ſhould prove a ſalutary leſſon to thoſe who, without any examination, adopt political and religious ideas, and ſport them in every company that will ſubmit to hear them. Had they only reflected on the perſons who had inſtilled them into their minds, or on the authors of the works whence they had adopted their ideas, how many honorable but miſguided perſons would, on ſuch an examination, find they were no more than the blind apoſtles of every religious and political iniquity, and the agents of deſigning men! Abuſes are certainly to be reformed, and our worſhip ought to be pure; but reflexion can never be detrimental to him who wiſhes to ſpeak on either. T.

Such

Such explanations of the Roſicrucian degree were only for thoſe dupes in whom they remarked a certain bias towards myſticity. The generality were abandoned to their own interpretations; but when an adept teſtified a great deſire of acquiring new lights, and was thought able to undergo the neceſſary trials, he was admitted to the degree of *Kadoſch*, or of the *regenerated man*, where all ambiguity ceaſes.

Degree of Kadoſch.

It was to this degree that the adept of whom we have before ſpoken was admitted. Nor was the exhauſted ſtate in which he found himſelf after having undergone thoſe trials to be wondered at. Adepts have told me, that no phyſical art is ſpared; that there is no machinery, ſpectres, terrors, &c. &c. which are not employed, to try the conſtancy of the candidate. We are told by Mr. Monjoye, that the Duke of Orleans was obliged to aſcend, and then throw himſelf off a ladder. If that were all, he was moſt kindly treated. A deep cave, or rather a precipice, whence a narrow tower riſes to the ſummit of the lodge, having no avenue to it but by ſubterraneous paſſages replete with horror, is the place where the candidate is abandoned to himſelf, tied hand and foot. In this ſituation he finds himſelf raiſed from the ground by machines making the moſt frightful noiſe. He ſlowly aſcends this dark vault, ſometimes for hours together, and then ſuddenly falls

as if he were not ſupported by any thing. Thus mounting and falling alternately, he muſt carefully avoid ſhowing any ſign of fear. All this however is a very imperfect account of the terrors of which men, who had undergone theſe trials, ſpeak. They declared that it was impoſſible for them to give an exact deſcription of them; they loſt their ſenſes; they did not know where they were. Draughts were given to them, which, adding to their corporal ſtrength, did not reſtore them to their mental faculties; but rather increaſed their ſtrength only to leave them a prey to fury and terror.

Many circumſtances relating to this degree made us believe at firſt ſight that it was connected with *Illuminiſm*; but on examination we find it to be only a farther explanation of the Maſonic allegory. Here again the candidate is transformed into an aſſaſſin. Here it is no longer the founder of Maſonry, Hiram, who is to be avenged, but it is Molay the Grand Maſter of the Knights Templars, and the perſon who is to fall by the aſſaſſin's hand is *Philippe le Bel*, King of France, under whoſe reign the order of the Templars was deſtroyed.

When the adept ſallies forth from the cavern with the reeking head, he cries *Nekom* (I have killed him). After this atrocious trial he is admitted to take the oath. I learned from one of the adepts, that at the time when he was about to take the oath, one of the *Knights Kadoſch* held a piſtol

at

at his breaſt, making a ſign that he would murder him if he did not pronounce it. On my aſking if he believed that it was in earneſt, he ſaid that he certainly did believe ſo, though he could not be ſure. At length the veil is rent aſunder. The adept is informed, that till now he had only been partially admitted to the truth; that Liberty and Equality, which had conſtituted the firſt ſecret on his admiſſion into Maſonry, conſiſted in recognizing no ſuperior on earth, and in viewing Kings and Pontiffs in no other light than as men on a level with their fellow men, having no other rights to ſit on the throne, or to ſerve at the altar, but what the people had granted them, and of which they had the power of depriving them whenever they pleaſed. They are alſo informed, that Princes and Prieſts have too long abuſed the goodneſs and ſimplicity of the people; that the grand object of Maſonry, in building temples to Liberty and Equality, is, to rid the earth of this double peſt, by deſtroying every altar which credulity and ſuperſtition had erected, and every throne on which were only to be ſeen deſpots tyrannizing over ſlaves.

Theſe documents concerning the degree of Kadoſch are not merely taken from the works of Meſſrs. Monjoye and Le Franc, but from adepts themſelves. Beſides, it is eaſy to perceive how exactly this account correſponds with the avowal of

of the adept who was obliged to own that I was quite in the right when I told him that this was the final object of Free-masonry.

Oh how profound the combination of these mysteries! their progress is slow and tortuous; but how artfully each degree tends to the grand object.

The different degrees compared.

In the two first degrees, that is to say, in those of *Apprentice* and *Fellow-craft*, the sect begins by throwing out its *Liberty and Equality*. After that, it occupies the attention of its novices with puerile games of fraternity or Masonic repasts; but it already trains its adepts to the profoundest secrecy by the most frightful oaths.

In that of *Master*, it relates the allegorical history of Adoniram, who is to be avenged; and of the *word*, which is to be recovered.

In the degree of *Elect*, it trains the adepts to vengeance, without pointing out the person on whom it is to fall. It carries them back to the time of the Patriarchs, when, according to them, men knew no religion but that of nature, and when every body was equally Priest and Pontiff. But it had not as yet declared that all religion revealed since the time of the Patriarchs was to be thrown aside.

This last mystery is only developed in the Scotch degrees. There the brethren are declared free; The word so long sought for is, Deism; it is the worship

worſhip of Jehovah, ſuch as was known to the Philoſophers of nature. The true Maſon becomes the Pontiff of Jehovah; and ſuch is the grand myſtery by which he is extricated from that darkneſs in which the prophane are involved.

In the degree *Roſæ Crucis* he who wreſted the *word*, who deſtroyed the worſhip of *Jehovah*, is Chriſt himſelf, the Author of Chriſtianity; and it is on the Goſpel and on the Son of Man that the adept is to avenge the brethren, the Pontiffs of *Jehovah*.

At length, on his reception as *Kadoſch*, he learns that the aſſaſſin of Adoniram is the King, who is to be killed to avenge the Grand Maſter Molay, and the order of the Maſons ſucceſſors of the Knights Templars. The religion which is to be deſtroyed to recover the *word*, or the true doctrine, is the religion of Chriſt, founded on revelation. This word in its full extent is *Liberty and Equality*, to be eſtabliſhed by the total overthrow of the altar and the throne.

Such are the incipient degrees, the proceſs, and the whole ſyſtem of Maſonry; it is thus that the ſect by its gradual explanation of its twofold principle of *Liberty and Equality*, of its allegory of the founder of Maſonry to be avenged, of the word to be recovered, leading the adepts from ſecret to ſecret, at length initiates them into the whole Jacobinical code of Revolution.

We

We are not to loſe ſight of the extreme care with which the adept is queſtioned on all that he has ſeen before, whenever he is initiated to a new degree, leſt he ſhould overlook the intimate connection ſubſiſting between each; and thus in the firſt degrees *Liberty and Equality* are given to him as the ſecret, while the complete explanation and application of them form the myſteries of the laſt*.

The more frightful theſe hidden myſteries of the Lodges ſhall appear to the hiſtorian, the more ſtrenuouſly it becomes his duty to inſiſt on the numbers of honeſt Maſons who never partook of theſe horrid myſteries. Nothing is more eaſy than to be duped in Maſonry. Such may have been the lot of thoſe who only ſeek to make acquaintances in the Lodges, or to paſs their leiſure hours with men apparently intimate at firſt ſight. It is true, that this intimacy ſeldom extends beyond the walls of the Lodge; but the days of their meeting are often days of feſtivity. Theſe repaſts are certainly heightened by the temporary Equality, which adds much to the mirth of the meeting; and all cares ſubſide for the day. What has been ſaid of

* I am not ignorant of the exiſtence of ſeveral other degrees in Occult Maſonry, ſuch as thoſe of the *Star* and of the *Druids*. The Pruſſians have added theirs, and the French have done as much. We thought it ſufficient to attach ourſelves to the moſt common ones, as moſt proper to delineate the conduct and ſpirit of the ſect.

certain

certain aſſemblies where decency was not reſpected, is moſt certainly the invention of calumny. The extreme order and morality of theſe meetings has often proved a ſnare to captivate thoſe who are to be caught with outward appearances, and Caglioſtro's infamous behaviour would have made many deſert the Lodges. This monſtrous Adonis diſguſted all Straſbourg, and was betrayed by the cries of the Egyptian ſiſters. It was no longer the age when the myſteries of the Adamites could be approved of. He was driven from that town for having attempted to introduce them. He would in like manner have ruined the craft had he continued to confound his Lodges with thoſe of the Eaſt. Such was not the behaviour of our modern Maſonry; on the contrary it appeared, that it had neither Religion nor Government in view; and they were ſeldom mentioned in the generality of Lodges. It was only on the day of initiation, that the reflecting adept could ſurmiſe that it had any future object; but even on thoſe very days the trials were rather a ſubject of diverſion than of reflection; and, ſo far from meditating on the allegorical emblems, they were rather diverted from it by the ſect, until favourable diſpoſitions had been diſcovered in them for their farther initiation.—The ſect well knew, that a day would come when a ſmall number of the Occult Maſons would ſuffice to put all the inferior multitude of adepts in motion.

tion. It is thus that it may be eaſily explained how there have exiſted ſo many honeſt Maſons, and how ſo many are ſtill to be found who have never ſurmiſed any thing in their games but the myſteries of an innocent Liberty and Equality, no ways alluding either to Religion or the ſtate.

In defence of Engliſh Maſonry, we may add, that they allow only of the three firſt degrees.—Prudence and wiſdom have made them reject the wiſh of avenging the death of Adoniram on his pretended aſſaſſin, a wiſh that we have ſeen converted in the Occult Lodges into a deſire of revenging the Maſons and their founder Molay, and then into a wiſh of avenging the Maſonic Liberty and Equality by the extinction of all Kings. Nothing of this is to be found in the Engliſh Maſonry. Nor is that myſterious purſuit of the *word* which was loſt by Adoniram to be traced. You are immediately informed that it is *Jehovah*. He who could wiſh to draw certain inferences from this, would have a long courſe of reaſonings to run through, none of which appear to have ever been thought of by the Engliſh Maſons. With them *Jehovah* is no more than the univerſal god of human nature; it is to be ſure rather extraordinary that they ſhould pretend to be the only people who have any knowledge of that God; but their concluſion is, that all mankind, and particularly the Free-maſons, ought to live with and ſuccour each other like brethren.

Nothing

Nothing appears in their myſteries tending towards the hatred of Chriſtianity, or that of Kings.

Their laws and inſtitutes with reſpect to Religion are comprehended in declaring, "That a "Maſon will never be a ſtupid Athieſt nor an ir-"religious Libertine. That though in former "times every Maſon was obliged to profeſs the "religion of the ſtate or nation he lived in, at "preſent, leaving every one to enjoy his own "private opinions, they are only bound to follow "the religion in which every body agrees, a reli-"gion which conſiſts in being good, ſincere, "modeſt, and men of honour." Certainly ſuch laws do not oblige the Engliſh Maſon to be a Deiſt, but only to be an honeſt man, whatever may be his religion.

With regard to the civil powers, a part of their laws are expreſſed as follows: "A Maſon ſhall be "a peaceable ſubject, and cheerfully conform to "the laws of the country in which he reſides. "He ſhall not be concerned in plots or con-"ſpiracies againſt Government; and he ſhall pay "proper reſpect to the civil Magiſtrate. Should "a brother be implicated in rebellion againſt the "ſtate, he ſhall not be ſupported in his rebellion." Such are the laws to be found in Thomas Wolſon and William Preſton, the one full of contempt the other full of zeal for Engliſh Maſonry; both nevertheleſs agree as to the laws of the Lodges.

We

We are not therefore to confound Engliſh Maſonry with the Occult Lodges, which they have prudently rejected.

We perfectly well know that many Engliſh are initiated in the Occult myſteries of the Roſicrucians and Scotch degrees; but it is not their *Occult Science* which conſtitutes them Engliſh Maſons; for the firſt three degrees are all that are acknowledged in England.

Having made theſe exceptions, we ſhall continue our proofs; for it is not on their degrees alone that we have founded our judgment of the Occult Maſons. Were we ſtrangers to their rites and ceremonies, the reader will judge what opinions we ſhould form on peruſing the doctrines of their moſt celebrated writers.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

New Proofs of the Syſtem and Myſteries of the Occult Maſons.

IN order to form a proper idea of the extent of the ſyſtem of the Occult Lodges of Free-maſonry, let us combine in this Chapter two eſſential points; firſt, the general doctrine of the moſt zealous and learned Maſons; ſecondly, their divers opinions as to their origin.

Maſonic writers in general divide Free-maſonry into three claſſes, the Hermetic, the Cabaliſtic (which comprehends the Martiniſts), and the Eclectic Maſonry. Let us firſt take a view of the religious tenets of theſe different claſſes, and we ſhall find that, like our modern Sophiſters, they only agree in one point, and that is in their hatred to Chriſtianity and Revelation; in all other points we ſhall find them in perfect oppoſition to one another with reſpect to their religious tenets or rather blaſphemous impieties. Diviſion of the Syſtems and Maſonic ſects.

The Hermetic Maſonry, or the Scotch degrees, who work in chymiſtry, have adopted *Pantheiſm or the true Spinoſiſm.* With them *every thing is God, and God is every thing.* That is their grand Hermetic Maſonry.

myſtery, engraved in one word *Jehovah* on the ſtone brought by the Knights Templars from the Holy Land.

Let the reader refer to the preface of the zealous Knight of St. Andrew, who has given us ſuch a circumſtantial account of theſe degrees. He will there ſee our Knight reducing the reſult of his whole doctrine to this famous text of Hermes Triſmegiſtus, "All is part of God; if all is part, the "whole muſt be God. Therefore every thing that "is made made itſelf, and will never ceaſe to act, "for this agent cannot repoſe. And as God has "no end, ſo can his works have neither beginning "nor end." After having recited this paſſage our Pantheiſtical adept tells us, "Such is the ſum-"mary though expreſſive belief of the whole Her-"metic Syſtem;" in a word the whole religious ſyſtem of the Scotch degrees, with the diſcovery of which he is ſo much pleaſed.

Let not the reader ſuppoſe that he attempts to explain away the expreſſion *all is God.* In his opinion nothing but the groſſeſt ignorance and prejudice can diſapprove of the aſſertion. It is in vain to object, that, making the grain of ſand, the Heavens, the Earth, the animal, or man, *a part of God*, is rendering the Deity diviſible; for he will anſwer, that it is only the groſſeſt ignorance which hides from us, that *thoſe millions of millions of parts are ſo united together and ſo eſſentially conſti-*

tute

tute a God WHOLE, *that to ſeparate a ſingle particle would be to annihilate the* WHOLE *itſelf, or the Great* JEHOVAH. But, leſt the Knight of the Craft ſhould be vain on finding himſelf a part of God, our Hierophant informs us, that *as the little finger is always leſs than the whole body; ſo is man, though a ſmall particle of God, infinitely ſmaller than* JEHOVAH. Our adept may nevertheleſs rejoice, however ſmall a particle he may be of the Deity, as the day will come when he is to be reunited to *the great* WHOLE, the day when, every thing being reunited to the great Jehovah, harmony will be complete, *and true Pantheiſm will be eſtabliſhed for ever* *.

It is to be hoped that the reader does not expect us to trouble ourſelves with the refutation of ſo monſtrous a ſyſtem. The preface however is not the only part of that work which lays down this ſyſtem as the tenets of theſe degrees; for, after the deſcription of them, we find what are called *Solomon's Theſis*; alſo the *Archetype world*; and theſe are productions all tending to ſtrengthen them in their impiety †. We ſhall not therefore be accuſed of calumniating this branch of Maſonry by attributing to it a ſyſtem which makes the villain, like the juſt man, a conſtituent part of the Deity,

* Preface to the Scotch Degrees.

† Second Part, Edition of Stockholm, 1782.

and repreſents vice and virtue as the very action of the Deity; a ſyſtem which promiſes the ſame deſtiny to the good and to the wicked, of being *reunited to the Deity*; and thus, after having ceaſed to be man, of being God to all eternity.

Cabaliſtic Maſonry.

The Cabaliſtic ſyſtem, without being leſs impious, is far more humiliating for the human underſtanding; and that eſpecially in an age which pretends to the high-ſounding appellation of the Philoſophic age, of the age of light. It was in the Pruſſian Lodges of the Roſicrucians that this Cabaliſtic ſyſtem was to be found; at leaſt before their union with the Illuminés *. We have authentic information, that this was adopted by certain Lodges of Roſicrucians in France a few years before the Revolution, and particularly at Bourdeaux. To prevent, however, all poſſibility of being miſtaken, whatever we ſhall ſay on this ſubject ſhall be grounded on the Cabaliſtic lectures lately printed under the title of *Teleſcope de Zoroaſtre*. They are dedicated to one of thoſe Princes whom the author does not name, but whoſe zealous purſuits in theſe myſteries are ſufficiently known by public report. With ſuch a guide we ſhall not be accuſed of impoſing on our readers.

* Letters from Philon to Spartacus.

The

The JEHOVAH of this ſect is no longer the *God* WHOLE; but he is at once the *God* SISAMORO, and the *God* SENAMIRA. The firſt is joined by the *Genius* SALLAK, and the ſecond by the *Genius* SOKAK. If theſe famous Cabaliſtic words are inverted, we have *Oromaſis* or the *God* GOOD, and *Arimanes* the *God* EVIL, and the Genii will become *Kallas* and *Kakos, pretty correctly Greek for* GOOD *and* BAD *.

Thus in attributing to OROMASIS a multitude of *good* Genii or ſpirits like himſelf, and to ARIMANES *evil* Genii participating of his own wickedneſs, we have the JEHOVAH of *Cabaliſtic Maſonry*; that is to ſay, the *word* to be recovered in their Lodges, or the tenets to be ſubſtituted to thoſe of Chriſtianity.

Of theſe good and evil Genii, ſome are more perfect ſpirits and preſide over the planets, the riſing and ſetting of the Sun, the increaſe and decreaſe of the Moon; others, inferior to the firſt, but ſuperior to the human ſoul, exerciſe their empire over the Stars and Conſtellations; but in both theſe claſſes, the good are the angels of life, victory and happineſs, while the bad are the angels of death and calamity. All know the ſecrets of the paſt, preſent, and to come, and can impart this great ſcience to the adepts. To captivate

* Teleſcope de Zoroaſtre, page 13.

their favour, the Cabaliſtic Maſon is to ſtudy what we ſhould call the Conjuring-book. He muſt be well verſed in the names and ſigns of the planets and conſtellations; he muſt alſo know whether it be a good or evil Genius which preſides over it, and which are the numbers that repreſent them. By the word *Ghenelia*, for example, he muſt underſtand the riſing Sun, a pure, mild and active ſpirit, preſiding at births, and at all natural affections which are good. *Sethophoros*, on the contrary, is Saturn, the planet which may be looked upon as the head quarters of the evil Genii.

It is not our object to give a dictionary of all their Hieroglyphics, much leſs to deſcribe the circles, the triangles, the table, the urns, and the magic mirrors, in a word all the ſcience of the Cabaliſtic Roſicrucian. The reader has ſeen a ſufficient ſpecimen, to be convinced, that the whole is an incoherent ſyſtem of the vileſt and groſſeſt ſuperſtition. It might be only humiliating to nature, did not the adept carry his impiety to ſuch an extent, that he looks upon the communication with, and apparitions of the Devils, whom he invokes under the appellation of Genii, as a ſpecial favour, and on them he relies for the whole ſucceſs of his enchantments. If we are to credit the maſters of the art, the Cabaliſtic Maſon will be favoured by theſe good and evil Genii, in proportion to the confidence he has in their power; they

they will appear to him, and they will explain more to him in the magic table, than the human underſtanding can conceive.

Nor is the adept to fear the company of the *evil Genii*. He muſt firmly believe, that *the worſt among them*, the moſt hideous of thoſe beings which the vulgar call *Devils*, *are never bad company for mortals*. In many caſes he is to prefer the company of theſe evil Genii to that of the good; the latter frequently coſting you your reſt, fortune, and ſometimes even your life; while we often have the greateſt obligations to the former *.

From whenceſoever theſe Genii or Devils may come, it is from them alone that the adept can learn the occult ſciences, which will infuſe into him the ſpirit of prophecy. He will be informed, that Moſes, the Prophets, and the three Kings, had no other teachers, no other art, but that of Cabaliſtic Maſonry, like him and Noſtradamus.

When immerſed in this delirium of folly and impiety the adept becomes dear to the ſect. He will have ſhown that he prefers the doctrine of *Siſamoro* and of *Senamira* to that of the goſpel; that he had rather be a madman than a Chriſtian; and then he will have attained the grand object of the laſt myſteries of Cabaliſtic Maſonry.

* Id. page 118 and 136.

Thoſe Maſons who may have adoped a different courſe to arrive at the ſame end, are to take great care not to diſcredit the Cabal. Though they diſbelieve the art themſelves, let them ſay at leaſt, "That there is nothing wonderful in judicial "aſtrology but its means; that its tendency is ex- "tremely ſimple: That it is very poſſible, that "at the hour of your birth a ſtar ſhould be in a "certain poſition of the Heavens, and in a parti- "cular aſpect, and that nature ſhould follow a "particular courſe, which, through a concatena- "tion of cauſes, would be favourable or fatal to "you." Then let them add a few Sophiſms to corroborate this idea, and give themſelves out for learned Philoſophers, and the ſect will approve their conduct as tending to avenge the Cabaliſtic Maſon, and bring his ſcience into repute*.

* See the *Continuation* OF ERRORS AND OF TRUTH *by an unknown Philoſopher.* Maſonic Era 5784. Chap. OF VICES AND ADVANTAGES. Notwithſtanding the title of this book, it is far from being a *Continuation* of the work of which I am about to treat. It was only a ſnare laid by Holbach's club, who, ſeeing the immenſe run which Mr. de St. Martin's work had, adopted the title of *Continuation* OF ERRORS AND OF TRUTH to attract the curioſity of the public. In this pretended continuation, whole pages are copied from the works of the club, coinciding in nothing with Mr. de St. Martin's ſyſtem, excepting in its zeal for Maſonry.

Were

Were I not writing for the Hiſtorian, I ſhould fear to abuſe my reader's patience with the enumeration of theſe abſurdities of Occult Maſonry. But in deſcribing the grand cauſes of a Revolution *which threatens all Europe*, it is neceſſary at leaſt to give a general idea of thoſe ſyſtems of Impiety and Rebellion whence it originated. We ſpare him the trouble of reſearch, he will only have to verify our quotations; he will know from what ſources he is to derive his proofs. Beſide, one of the moſt dangerous arts of the ſect, is not only to hide its tenets and its variegated means of attaining its Revolutionary object, but it wiſhes even to conceal the very names of its different claſſes. That which may appear to be the fartheſt from Impiety or Rebellion may be the moſt ſtrenuous in its attempts to revive the antique ſyſtems of the bittereſt enemies to Governments and to Chriſtianity.

It may be matter of ſurprize to many, to ſee me comprehend the Martiniſts among the latter, they are, nevertheleſs, the perſons whom I had in view. As to the origin of Mr. de St. Martin, who has given them his name, we are ignorant; but we defy any body to ſhow a greater appearance of probity, or to aſſume a more devout and mellifluous myſtical ſtrain, than the hypocriſy of this ſpurious

offspring

offspring of Curbicus the ſlave *. We have been acquainted with men whom he had ſeduced, with others that he wiſhed to ſeduce, and all ſpoke of his great zeal and reſpect for Chriſt and his goſpel, and for Governments. We ſhall ſeek his doctrines and his views in his own writings, in the *Apocalypſe* of his adepts, in his famous book of ERRORS

* *Terebinthus*, or *Budda*, a diſciple of *Scythian*, a conjurer, finding that the Perſian Prieſts oppoſed his deſigns, retired to a *widow's houſe* in Paleſtine to whom he left all his money and books. She bought a ſlave named CURBICUS, whom ſhe afterwards adopted and cauſed to be inſtructed in all the ſciences of Perſia. After her death he quitted the name of *Curbicus*, to blot out the memory of his firſt condition, and took that of MANES, which in the Perſian language ſignifies *diſcourſe*. For an account of his doctrines many learned writers, and particularly St. Auguſtin, may be conſulted. They are repreſented as the common ſewer of all the impieties of the times, and as the ſeat of empire which Satan had choſen to himſelf.

Manes had the inſolence to promiſe the King of Perſia that he would cure his ſon by his prayers, and the credulous Prince, believing him, neglected the remedies of art, and ſent away his phyſicians. The ſon died, and Manes was thrown into priſon; but, eſcaping from thence, he fled into Meſopotamia; after various adventures however, falling into the hands of the King of Perſia, he was flayed alive, and his carcaſs caſt upon the dunghill to be devoured by wild beaſts. His ſkin was ſtuffed, and hung up on one of the city gates.—His followers honoured him as a martyr, and, in memory of his being flayed with reeds, *they ſlept upon them.*—(See the "Annals of the Church,"—Third Age). T.

AND

AND OF TRUTH. We have learned to our coſt what labour and what pains are neceſſary to unravel this work of darkneſs; but ſurely the ſame perſeverance ſhould be ſhown by the diſciples of truth, as by the adepts of darkneſs.

Much patience is requiſite to underſtand and to elucidate the code of the Martiniſt Maſon, amidſt its myſterious language of numbers and enigmas. We will ſpare as much as poſſible this trouble to our readers. Let the Hero of theſe doctrines appear, and he will be found to be no other than the ſervile copyiſt of the abſurdities of the Hereſiarch ſlave, and a rival of his hypocriſy. With all the tortuoſities of MANES we ſhall behold him leading his adepts through the ſame paths, infuſing into them the ſame hatred for the altars of Chriſtianity, for the thrones of Sovereigns, and for all political eſtabliſhments whatever. We will begin with his religious ſyſtems; but though we ſhall compreſs whole volumes of impious abſurdity into a few pages, ſtill we muſt again appeal to the patience of the reader; for as their Martiniſt Maſons contributed much to the Revolution, it is neceſſary that their ſophiſtical reveries ſhould be known.

We are, then, to form an idea of a *firſt being; one; univerſal; of himſelf; and the beginning of all principle.* At firſt ſight, this *firſt being* appears to be the *God* WHOLE, or the *Jehovah* of Pantheiſm: and

and ſuch really is the *firſt being* of the Martiniſts *. But this *God* WHOLE comprehends a twofold God; one the principle of *good*, the other of *evil*. The former, though produced by the *firſt being*, *holds of itſelf the whole of its power, and all its worth*. It is infinitely good, and can *only do good*. It produces another being of its own ſubſtance, at firſt good like itſelf, but which ſoon becomes infinitely bad, and can do nothing but evil †. The *God* GOOD, though it holds all its power of itſelf, could neither create this *world, nor any corporeal being, without the means of the God* EVIL ‡: the one *acts*, the other *reacts*, and from their conflicts the world is framed, and bodies are formed of the *ſparks*, as it were, emanating from this ſtruggle between the *God or principle of* GOOD, *and the God or principle of* EVIL.

" Man already exiſted at that time, *as no origin* " *can be anterior to man*. He is antecedent to " any being in nature; he exiſted before the birth " of the Genii; nevertheleſs he only came after " them §. Man at that time exiſted without a " body, and a much preferable ſtate to that in " which he is at preſent; for, inaſmuch as his " actual ſtate is limited, and replete with diſguſt,

* Of Errors and of Truth, 2d Part, page 149.

† Firſt Section.

‡ Ibid. Of Temporal Cauſes and Concatenations.

§ Ibid. Of Primitive Man.

" ſo

" ſo was his former unlimited and abounding in " delights *.

By the ill uſe he made of his Liberty, he erred from the centre at which the *God* GOOD had placed him; he then acquired a body, and that was the period of his firſt fall. But in his fall he preſerved his dignity; he is ſtill of the ſame *eſſence* as the *God* GOOD. To convince ourſelves of it, " we have " only to reflect on the nature of thought; and " we ſhall ſoon perceive, that it being ſimple, one, " and unalterable, there can be but one ſort of " being capable of it; as nothing can be common " between beings of different natures. We ſhall " obſerve, that if man has in himſelf an idea of a " Supreme Being, of an active and intelligent " cauſe which executes his will, he muſt be of the " ſame eſſence as that ſuperior Being †." Therefore, according to the Martiniſt Syſtem, *the God* GOOD, *the God* EVIL, and every *thinking being*, or, in other words, God, Man, and the Devil, are of the ſame nature, the ſame eſſence, and the ſame ſpecies.

* Ibid.—We think it neceſſary to inform our readers, that we have made uſe of the Edinburgh edition, which is the leaſt enigmatical. As Philoſophiſm and Impiety gained ground, the Martiniſts thought they might have fewer *voluntary* obſcurities, and they have ſuppreſſed, or given in common print, what was originally only expreſſed in cyphers, in which the firſt edition abounds.

† Ibid. Of the Affinities of Thinking Beings, page 205.

If

If therefore the adept does not think himſelf God or Devil, it is not the fault of his teachers. There is, however, a remarkable difference between man and the *God* EVIL. For the Devil, or the principle of Evil, ſeparated from the *God* GOOD, can never return to him; whereas man will return to the ſame ſtate he was in antecedently to time and the *ſparkling* conflict. "He erred "by going from four to nine, but re-eſtabliſhes "himſelf by returning from nine to four *."

This enigmatical jargon becomes more intelligible as the adept advances in the myſteries. He learns that the number *four* ſignifies *a ſtrait line*— number *nine* the *circumference* or the *curve line* †: then that the ſun is a *quaternary* number; that number *nine* repreſents *the moon*, and conſequently

* This was preciſely the leſſon Mr. de St. Martin was explaining to the Marquis de C——. He traced his circles on the table; then, pointing to the centre, he added, "You ſee "how every thing emanating from the centre moves in the "radius to reach the circumference."—"I perceive it," ſays the Marquis? "but I alſo obſerve, that having reached "the circumference this body emanating from the centre "may proceed in a tangent or a ſtrait line; and then I do "not underſtand how you can demonſtrate that it muſt neceſ- "ſarily be returned back to the centre." This was ſufficient to diſconcert the learned Doctor of the Martiniſts. He nevertheleſs continued to teach, that ſouls emanating from God by the number four, would return to him by the number nine.

† Ibid. 2d Part, page 106, 126.

the

the earth of which it is but a ſatellite *: and hence the adept concludes, that man anterior to time was in the ſun or in the centre of light. That he flew from thence by the radius, and that, paſſing by the moon, he remains on the earth, until the time comes when he ſhall be reflected back to his centre, to be incorporated with the *God* GOOD.

In the mean time, till he can enjoy that happineſs, "it is a moſt fallacious ſyſtem to pretend to "lead men to wiſdom *by the frightful deſcription of* "*eternal flames in a life to come.* Such deſcriptions "are of no avail when unfelt; therefore the blind "teachers, who can only repreſent thoſe torments "to us in imagination, muſt neceſſarily produce "but little effect upon us †."

The enlightened Martiniſt, ſoaring above ſuch teachers, eraſes the pains of hell from his moral code; and it is worthy of remark, that this is the leading feature in the Syſtems of the Sophiſters of the Occult Lodges, as well as of the Sophiſters of the Secret Academy. We ſhould be tempted to ſuppoſe, that they knew no means of working their ſalvation but by deſtroying the poſſibility of being damned; and that, by denying the exiſtence of hell, they ſought to harden themſelves and all nations to crimes the moſt deſerving of the divine vengeance.

* Ibid. Page 114 and 215.
† Ibid. Firſt Section.

The

The Martiniſt ſubſtitutes "*three temporal worlds.* "There are but three degrees of Expiation, or "three degrees of real F. M. *(Free-maſonry).*" This is pretty clearly aſſerting, that the perfect Maſon neither has ſin to fear, nor penance to perform; but in every ſenſe the reader can no longer doubt of the ſyſtematic impiety which reigns throughout theſe abſurdities, in direct oppoſition to the Goſpel. It was not ſufficient for the ſect to renew in their hatred the ancient blaſphemies of a ſenſeleſs Philoſophy; but the deteſtation of Laws, Sovereigns, and Governments, was to mingle with their myſteries; and in this our Martiniſt adept only primes over the Jacobin, by the art and cunning with which he infuſes his ſpirit of Rebellion, and broods over the downfal of the Throne.

Let not the zealous adept appear, proteſting his reſpect for the Throne or Government; I have heard their proteſtations, I have heard thoſe of their maſters; but I have alſo heard their doctrines, and ſeen their tranſactions. It is in vain for their chief to teach them privately, or to envelop them in enigmatic language; for, had I not hereafter to unfold the iniquitous myſteries of the Illuminées, the reader would be ready to pronounce, without heſitation, that of all the conſpiring ſects the Martiniſt Lodges are the moſt dangerous.

Necker,

Necker, La Fayette, or Mirabeau, notwithſtanding their Sovereignty of the People, ſought a Conſtitutional King; Briſſot, Syeyes, or Petion, ſupported the Republican Syſtem; conventions, compacts, and oaths, were admitted by both. But the Martiniſt denies the legitimacy of every Empire which may have originated in violence, force, or conqueſt; he denies all ſociety whoſe foundation reſts on conventions or compacts, though freely entered into. The former are acts of tyranny, which never can be legitimated; no antiquity, no *preſcription* can render them valid, *preſcription* being a mere invention of tyranny, as a palliative to injuſtice, in direct oppoſition to the laws of nature, which knows of no ſuch invention. "The edifice formed on a voluntary aſſociation "is equally as imaginary as if it were on a forced "aſſociation *." To prove theſe two aſſertions, and particularly the latter, is the main object of our Hero's Sophiſtry. He eaſily decides, that it is *impoſſible that any ſocial compact could have been freely entered into by all the individuals of a ſtate.* He aſks, *whether it ſtands to reaſon that man ſhould rely on thoſe who had formed ſuch a compact, or whether they ever had the power of forming it?* He examines the queſtion, and concludes, "that a voluntary "aſſociation is neither more juſt nor reaſonable

* Ibid. Section 5.

" than it is practicable, ſince by ſuch an act, man " muſt inveſt other men with a right (his own li- " berty) which he cannot diſpoſe of himſelf; and " ſince he transfers a right which he has not, *he* " *makes a convention which is abſolutely void, and* " *which neither himſelf, the chiefs, nor ſubjects can* " *put into execution, ſince it can neither have been* " *binding on the one nor the other* *."

Then come the innocent artifices of proteſtations of fidelity and ſubmiſſion to the reigning powers, and invitations not to trouble the order of the exiſting laws and governments; but ſtupidity itſelf cannot be duped by ſuch artifices. After the Martiniſt has told us, that ſocial compacts, though freely formed, are null, and that aſſociations formed by force are void, what can be the ſubmiſſion which the Civil Laws, the Magiſtrates, or the Princes can exact from their ſubjects?

The Hero of the Martiniſts alſo ſhudders at the very idea of revolt, or of inſurrection; but then it is becauſe the individual is expoſed to acts of violence reſulting from *private authority*. When the mob ſhall have imbibed theſe principles, when *private* violences are no longer to be feared, what will all theſe reſtrictions and exhortations avail for the preſervation of peace and ſubmiſſion to the conſtituted authorities? Does not the Martiniſt

* Ib. Part II. Sect. 5, page 9.

try

try every means to perſuade that ſame mob that there never exiſted a legitimate Prince, nor a lawful Government? Is he not perpetually recalling them to their *firſt origin*, " when the rights of one " man over another were not known, becauſe it " was impoſſible that ſuch rights could exiſt among " *equal beings* *?"

With them, it is ſufficient to obſerve the variations of Governments, and their ſucceſſion; that ſome have periſhed, others are periſhing, or will periſh before the end of the world, to be convinced that they are no more than the offspring of *the caprice of man, or of their diſordered imaginations* †.

In fine, I know that the Martiniſt makes profeſſion of a true government, a real authority of man over men, and that he pleaſes to call it a Monarchy. But notwithſtanding all the ſubtilties of his myſterious language, this very profeſſion will prove to be the moſt univerſal Conſpiracy againſt every exiſting Government. He tells us, that there is a ſuperiority to be acquired by one man over others, the ſuperiority of learning, of means, of experience, which bring him nearer to his *original ſtate*, and this is a ſuperiority *of fact*, " and of neceſſity, becauſe other men, having ap- " plied leſs and not having reaped the ſame ad- " vantages, will ſtand in need of him, from the

* Ibid. Part II. page 16 and 17.

† Ibid. Of the Inſtability of Governments, page 34 and 35.

" poverty and dimneſs of their faculties *."— The reader will naturally conclude, that according to this ſyſtem nobody could exerciſe a lawful authority over his equals, but in right of his virtues, his experience, and his means of being uſeful. And that is in reality the firſt artifice of the ſect, which immediately overthrows all idea of hereditary ſucceſſion, which ſubmits the rights of the Sovereign to the reveries of the factious and of the populace on the virtue, talents, and ſucceſs of him who governs. But let us follow their windings, and unfold their myſterious writings. " If every " man, ſay they, attained to the ſame degree of " his own power, then every man would be a " King."

Theſe words evidently ſhow, that in the ſenſe of the Martiniſt, he only is not King who is not arrived at the laſt degree of *his power*, or of his ſtrength in the *natural* ſtate. A little further it appears, that this difference alone can conſtitute a real political authority, that ſuch is the *principle of unity, the only one* by which nature allows the exerciſe of a legitimate authority over men, *the only light which can reunite them in a body* †.

The reader may believe it to be a chimerical reſearch to ſeek in the hiſtory of man for a ſociety where he alone commands whoſe *powers* or facul-

* Ibid. page 18. † Ibid. page 29.

ties

ties have been the beſt developed in the order of nature, where he alone obeys who has not acquired this *degree of power*; but the Martiniſt will carry him back " to thoſe happy days ſaid to have had " no exiſtence but in the imagination of the poets, " becauſe, diſtant from them, and ſtrangers to " their ſweets, we have been weak enough to be- " lieve, that becauſe we did not enjoy them, they " could not exiſt *."

Should you not immediately perceive that the only legitimate authority is that exerciſed of old, or in the golden age, when each father of a family was the ſole king; when the ſon, acquiring ſufficient ſtrength and age to develope his *powers*, became king himſelf; ſhould you deny theſe conſequences, and object, that no government had ever perpetuated itſelf ſince the commencement of the world, and that conſequently the rule given to diſcover the only legitimate government pointed out none; you are then left to your own imagination, and the adept will continue, " Nevertheleſs, it is one of " thoſe truths which I can beſt affirm, nor do I " pledge myſelf too far, when I certify to my " equals, that there are governments which have " *ſubſiſted ever ſince man was firſt placed upon earth,* " *and will ſubſiſt until the end*; and that for the " ſame reaſons which made me aſſert, that here

* Ibid.

" below there always had been and always will " be legitimate governments *." What then are or can be theſe legitimate governments which the Martiniſt recognizes? What can be theſe governments which have ſubſiſted from the beginning, and will ſubſiſt until the end of time? None can be ſurmiſed, but that of the patriarchs, or of the firſt families governed by the ſole paternal authority. In later ages, can any other be found than that of iſolated families, or of the Nomades, the Tartars, or the Savages roaming through foreſts without any other chief than the father of the family? And it is there alone, that thoſe whoſe age has equally developed their ſtrength and *their power*, will find themſelves all *equal* and each *a king*, that is to ſay, each one recognizing no other law than his own, and each acquiring at the ſame age all the power of a father over his children. This government may perhaps be traced in civil ſociety; each private family abſtractedly taken may be ſaid to perpetuate this government, and it has exiſted and will perpetuate itſelf until the end of time. Now let the reader reflect on what has been ſaid on governments formed by force or free compact, on thoſe governments which have periſhed, do periſh, or will periſh before the end of time, and which by this diſtinctive mark are known

* Ibid. Page 35 and 36.

to

to be illegitimate. He will clearly perceive, that all the zeal of the Martiniſts for the *true monarchy*, for the *only legitimate* government, the *only one conſiſtent with nature*, the only one laſting as the world, is nothing elſe but the wiſh of reducing all ſociety, all legitimate authority, to that of a father governing his children; to overturn every throne and annihilate every law but that of the ancient patriarchs.

Such is the whole tendency of the political ſyſtem of the Martiniſts. Many more blaſphemies both religious and political might be extracted from this work; nor would it be impoſſible to prove, that in the ſenſe of the Martiniſts, the *great adultery* of man, the true cauſe of all his misfortunes in this world, the real original ſin of mankind, was his having divorced himſelf from the laws of nature, to ſubject himſelf to laws which nature condemns, to thoſe of Emperors, of Kings, and even of Republics, in a word, to any other authority except the paternal *. But this matter would require us to follow all the windings of their myſterious language, a taſk that would be as tedious to my reader as to myſelf. I truſt therefore that he will not be diſpleaſed with me for having ſpared him the labour of reſearch, which I have endured in the taſk of gathering from amidſt theſe *voluntary ob-*

* Part II. Sect. 3. Art. ADULTERY.

ſcurities ſome of thoſe luminous traits which now and then eſcape the ſect; and the re-union of which leaves no doubt as to the grand object of this Apocalypſe.

In reading over and ſtudying this extraordinary code, one would be tempted to decide with Voltaire, *that there never was printed a more abſurd, obſcure, mad, or fooliſh work*; and we ſhould be equally ſurprized that ſuch a code had produced ſo many enthuſiaſts, or that we know not what *Dean* of Philoſophy had been ſo much enchanted with it *. But in all probability this *Dean* had not ſent the word of the enigma to Voltaire; he had not told him that this voluntary obſcurity was one of the moſt powerful means employed by the ſect to cruſh the altar and the throne. The works of Voltaire himſelf had not the celebrity of Mr. de St. Martin's Apocalypſe. The greater the obſcurity the more it attracted the curioſity and piqued the vanity of his diſciples; the adepts of the firſt claſs tutored and explained it to the young novices, and none were more eager than thoſe of the fair ſex. Their dreſſing-rooms were metamorphoſed into ſecret ſchools, where the interpreting adept developed the myſteries of each page, and the novice in extaſy applauded the myſtery which was hidden from the vulgar. Little by little the novice herſelf became

* Let. of Voltaire to D'Alembert, Oct. 22, 1776.

an

an interpreter, and founded a ſpecies of ſchool.—This is not a mere aſſertion; ſuch ſchools for the explanation of the code exiſted at Paris and in the Provinces, particularly at Avignon, the head-quarters of the Martiniſts. I was and am acquainted with ſeveral perſons who were introduced to theſe ſchools. They were the preparatory ſteps to initiation. There they learned the art of impoſing on the ſimple by factitious apparitions, which ended by caſting ridicule on the ſect; the art of conjuring up the dead; the art of making abſent perſons ſpeak, or of ſeeing them at a thouſand miles diſtance; in fine, all thoſe arts which quacks and mountebanks of all ages have invented to delude the populace, and rob them of their money, the Martiniſt ſtudied to enable them to make converts to Impiety and Rebellion.

This ſect made great progreſs in France and Germany; ſome even have reached England; and every where their grand object is to repreſent the French Revolution as the fire which is to purify the world.

Notwithſtanding the multitude of the Martiniſt Maſons, they are not nearly ſo numerous as the Eclectic Maſons; and theſe indeed ſhould naturally predominate in an age when the Philoſophiſm of the Atheiſts and Deiſts only ſucceeds to the ancient hereſies in order to abſorb them all.

The

Eclectic Maſonry.

The appellation of Eclectic is applied to a Free-maſon, as it was formerly to certain Philoſophers. We are to underſtand by this word thoſe of the adepts who, after having paſſed through the different degrees of Maſonry, attach themſelves to no particular ſyſtem, either political or religious, into which they have been initiated, but adopt from them all whatever may beſt ſuit their political or religious views *. They are neither Hermetic, Cabaliſtic nor Martiniſt Maſons; they are what they pleaſe, Deiſts, Atheiſts, Sceptics, an aggregate of all the errors of the Philoſophiſm of the day. They, like the ſimple Sophiſters of the age, have a twofold point of union. With reſpect to Religion, they all admit that Liberty and Equality which denies every authority but their own reaſon, and rejects all revealed religion; as to governments, they admit of no Kings, unleſs ſubſervient to the will of the people in right of its ſovereignty. I ſhall be very brief on this claſs; it is that of the Briſſots, Condorcets or Lalandes; in a word of the Sophiſters of the day, whom we ſhall ſoon ſee combining with Maſonry to operate their Revolution. Were we to expoſe their ſyſtems it would only be a repetition of what has been ſaid of the Sophiſters conſpiring againſt the altar and the throne; and the multitude of theſe abettors of Impiety who

* See the Archives of the Free-maſons and Roſicrucians, Chap. 3. Edition of Berlin, 1785.

were

were in our time aggregated to the Maſonic Lodges would alone prove how peculiarly ſuch plots coincided with their principles.

I know that there is another ſpecies of Eclectic Maſons lately eſtabliſhed in Germany. Theſe not only make profeſſion of appertaining to no particular ſyſtem of Maſonry, but aſſert alſo that they depend on none. According to them, all are independent, all have the right of making their own laws. It is for that reaſon that they have aboliſhed the very names of Grand Lodge and of Scotch Lodge: and in this reſpect they may be ſaid to have improved upon Maſonic Liberty and Equality *.

In this light the Eclectic Maſons could not have been very numerous in France, as the major part of them were under the inſpection of the Grand Pariſian Lodge called the *Grand Orient*. But our modern Sophiſters had introduced into all the Lodges the true Eclectic ſpirit of Impiety; and ſentiment was a ſtronger tie than a profeſſed opinion. This ſentiment, to be uniform, muſt agree in hating Chriſt and his Religion, in deteſting all Sovereignty and all Legiſlative Power, except that of the people. The Eclectic Maſon, like the Sophiſters, are at liberty to ſubſtitute Deiſm or Atheiſm to Chriſtianity, to replace Mo-

* See the Rules of their Aſſociation, Frankfort, 18th May, 1783, ſigned Ruſtner and Rottberg Secretaries.

narchy

narchy by Democracy or even by a Democratic Monarchy; but a ſtep leſs towards Liberty and Equality would ſuffice to baniſh him from the Occult Lodges.

All claſſes therefore, every code of Maſonry, Hermetic, Cabaliſtic or Martiniſts, and Eclectic, all and each forwarded the Revolution; and it little imported to the ſect which ſtruck the blow, provided ruin enſued*.

I promiſed to add to theſe proofs thoſe which more particularly reſult from the divers opinions of Maſons on their origin. Let us here again be only guided by the moſt learned and zealous of the ſect. The reader will conſider whether the parents they have adopted would not ſuffice alone to direct their judgement on the plots of their progeny.

* La Metherie's Journal de Phyſique, 1790.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Proofs of the Origin of Free-maſons drawn from their own Syſtems.

LET us begin by rejecting the opinions of all thoſe demi-adepts, who in their reſearch on Maſonry, led away by the ſimilarity of name, really believe themſelves deſcended from the Maſons who built the Tower of Babel, or who raiſed the pyramids of Egypt, or more particularly from thoſe who erected Solomon's Temple, or who worked at the Tower of Straſbourg; in fine, of thoſe who laid the foundations of ſo many Churches in Scotland in the tenth century. Theſe men of mortar had never been admitted to the myſteries. If it be true that they ever conſtituted a part of the Brotherhood, they were ſoon excluded; their minds were too blunt and not ſufficiently Philoſophic *.

* I make this obſervation, as it is very poſſible that the name and implements of the Craft may be borrowed from the real Maſons. Many mechanical arts, in France at leaſt, had their ſigns, their ceremonies, their hidden language, which conſtituted the ſecret of the profeſſion. This language and theſe ſigns ſerved to diſtinguiſh the workmen, and denoted the

They were no longer wanted, when once the trowel, the compaſſes, the cubic ſtone, the truncated or entire columns, became nothing more than

the degree they had acquired, whether of Apprentice or Maſter; and was a method of recognizing thoſe who on the road aſked for work, or for ſupport to enable them to continue their journey. For all men of the ſame profeſſion are naturally inclined to help each other in preference to ſtrangers.

It is very poſſible that in time ſome of the adepts initiated in the myſteries of the ſect gained admiſſion among the mechanical Maſons. Theſe adepts may have formed others among thoſe mechanics. Then, to form a ſeparate ſociety, it was only neceſſary to adopt new ſigns, and chooſe different emblems from thoſe workmen and the Lodges were ready formed.

What may corroborate this ſuppoſition is, that there exiſts in France another profeſſion, which, had it not been for one obſtacle, might have undergone a ſimilar change. This is the profeſſion of the FENDEURS *(Hewers of Wood)*. Theſe men alſo form a confraternity. They have their ſigns, their watch-word, their ſecret and their convivial meetings. They call themſelves *L'Ordre des* FENDEURS *(the Order of the Hewers of Wood)*. They admit Gentlemen and Burgeſſes into their order, who are initiated into the ſecret, and attend their meetings and repaſts in the ſame manner as the Free-maſons do theirs. I have known men who were both Maſons and *Fendeurs*, and who from their birth and ſtations in life had far other occupations than ſplitting of wood. They were as reſerved with reſpect to the ſecret of the *Fendeurs* as to that of Maſonry. I knew the ſentiments of theſe adepts, and ſhould not be ſurpriſed that the ſole reaſon why they took ſo great an intereſt in the ſecret of the Fendeurs was from its ſimila-

rity

than ſyſtematic emblems; and the learned adepts bluſh at an origin which they conſider as too ignoble.

We will ſubdivide into two claſſes the divers opinions ſet forth in order to ennoble their origin. In the firſt claſs, we comprehend all thoſe who aſcend back to the myſteries of the Egyptian prieſts, to thoſe of Eleuſis or the Greeks, or thoſe who pretend to filiate from the Druids, or even who call themſelves deſcendants of the Jews. In the ſecond claſs, we conſider thoſe who only trace

Various opinions of Freemaſons on their origin.

rity to that of Maſonry, or elſe, that in time, our adepts of the town were in hopes of *Philoſophizing* their brethren of the woods. The grand obſtacle to the propagation of theſe principles would be the difficulty and infrequency of their meetings, which are held in the midſt of foreſts, far from the eye of the prophane, and only in fine weather. Should the Philoſophiſt take it into his head to convert theſe repaſts into thoſe of Liberty and Equality, in a word, of the Golden Age, then adepts would flock in from all parts, Sophiſticated diſſertations and allegories would be introduced; but the uncouth inhabitant of the woods would no longer be able to comprehend the myſteries. Some of the ſigns would be changed, the emblems of the profeſſion would be preſerved, and the Sophiſticated Lodges of the *Fendeurs* eſtabliſhed in the towns would ceaſe to be open to the clowniſh mechanics from whom they had adopted their allegorical emblems. It is very poſſible that ſuch may have been the caſe with the Mechanical Maſons. This however is no more than a conjecture as to the mode of the ſect; our readers will ſoon ſee that we are not reduced to ſuch uncertainty with regard to the origin of its ſecret and of its doctrine.

themſelves

themſelves from the Knights Templars, or the Age of the Cruſades *.

If

* For theſe divers opinions let the reader conſult from among the learned and zealous Maſons of Germany, the GESCHICHTE DER UNBEKANNTEN *or the Hiſtory of the Unknown*, 1780, with this Epigraph—*Gens æterna eſt, in quâ nemo naſcitur*—ARCHIV FUR FREYMAURER, or *the Archives of the Freemaſons, Berlin* 1784—UBER DIE ALTEN UND NEUEN MYSTERIEN, or *of Ancient and Modern Myſteries, Berlin* 1782—DIE HEBRAISCHE MYSTERIEN; ODER DIE ALTESTE RELIGIOSE FREYMAURERY, *the Myſteries of the Hebrews, or the moſt ancient religious Freemaſonry, Leipſic* 1788. Among the Engliſh Maſons he may conſult THE SPIRIT OF MASONRY *by William Hutchinſon*—and among the French *Guillemain de St. Victor* ON THE ORIGIN OF MASONRY, &c.

Let the reader remember that ſeveral of theſe works might have been quoted for the greateſt abſurdities that Maſonry is guilty of. For example in the ARCHIVES OF FREEMASONRY, ſeveral diſſertations are to be found written by their Doctors on the Cabaliſtic art, and that even by an Engliſh Doctor, for the defence and inſtruction of the Roſicrucians.—I was really confounded, and almoſt aſhamed, when among other abſurdities I read, "ASTROLOGY is a ſcience which "by the ſituation of the ſtars reveals the cauſes of what has "come to paſs and foretells what is to come. This ſcience "has had its blots, but that deſtroys neither the foundation "nor the *ſanctity* of the art." And this is written by an Engliſh Doctor to juſtify the Roſicrucian Lodges, and to be preſerved in their Archives. (*See theſe Archives in German, Part III. No.* 18, *Page* 378). I have added this quotation, becauſe I am always afraid of its being ſaid, that I attribute incre-

If we examine never ſo carefully the reaſons on which the learned Maſons ground their filiation from the ancient Philoſophers, they will be found to contain merely this aſſertion: "that in thoſe ancient "times when men firſt began to deſert the pri- "mitive truths, to follow a religion and morality "founded on ſuperſtition, ſome ſages were to be "met with who ſegregated themſelves from the "general maſs of ignorance and corruption. Theſe "ſages, perceiving that the groſſneſs or the ſtu- "pidity of the people rendered them incapable of "profiting by their leſſons, formed ſeparate "ſchools and diſciples, to whom they tranſmitted "the whole ſcience of the ancient truths and of "the diſcoveries they had made by their profound "meditations on the nature, the religion, the "polity, and the rights of man. In theſe leſſons "ſome inſiſted on the unity of God or true Deiſm, "others on the unity of the Great Being, or Pan- "theiſm. The morality deduced from theſe prin- "ciples was pure; it was grounded on the duties "of charity, on the rights of Liberty, and on the "means of living peaceably and happily. Left

How and why the Free-maſons trace back their origin.

incredible things to Freemaſonry. I know that in one ſenſe they are incredible, but it is ſo only to thoſe who are ſtrangers to the proofs. Were the books of Maſonry in different languages to be conſulted, eſpecially thoſe in German, they would be found to ſuperabound in proofs.

" theſe doctrines ſhould leſſen in value, ſhould be
" falſified or be entirely loſt, theſe ſages com-
" manded their diſciples to keep them ſecret.—
" They alſo gave them ſigns and a particular
" language by which they were to recognize each
" other. All thoſe who were admitted to this
" ſchool and to theſe myſteries were the children
" of Light and Liberty, while all the reſt of man-
" kind were with reſpect to them but *ſlaves* and
" *prophane beings*; and hence their contempt for
" the vulgar. This was alſo the reaſon why the
" diſciples of Pythagoras obſerved ſuch a pro-
" found ſilence, the origin of that particular and
" ſecret ſcience of the divers ſchools. Hence the
" myſteries of the Egyptians and afterwards of the
" Greeks and of the Druids, even the very my-
" ſteries of the Jews themſelves, or of Moſes ini-
" tiated in all the ſecrets of the Egyptians.

" Theſe divers ſchools and the ſecrets of theſe
" myſteries have not been loſt; the Philoſophers
" of Greece tranſmitted them to thoſe of Rome,
" and the Philoſophers of all nations followed the
" ſame line of *conduct after the eſtabliſhment of*
" *Chriſtianity*. The ſecret was always preſerved,
" becauſe it was *neceſſary to avoid the perſecutions*
" *of an intolerant Church and of its Prieſts*. The
" ſages of divers nations by means of the ſigns
" which had been originally eſtabliſhed, recogni-
" zed each other, as the Freemaſons do every

" where

" where at this preſent day. The name only has " been changed; and the ſecret has been handed " down under the denomination of Freemaſonry, " as it was formerly under the ſanction of the Magi, " of the Prieſts of Memphis or of Eleuſis, and of " Platonic or Eclectic Philoſophers. Such is the " origin of Maſonry, ſuch are the cauſes which " perpetuate it, and which render it the ſame in " all parts of the world *."

This is the faithful reſult of what the moſt learned Maſons have publiſhed on their origin.— It is not our object to examine how falſe are ſuch ideas on the pretended doctrine of the Perſian, Egyptian, Grecian, Roman or Druid ſages, nor how contrary to all hiſtory. In the firſt place, can any thing be more abſurd than to ſuppoſe, that there exiſted a unity of religious opinions, of morality, and of ſecrets among Philoſophers, who have left behind them ſyſtems as variegated, and as oppoſite to each other, and as abſurd as thoſe of our modern ſophiſticated Philoſophiſts †? Nor do I undertake to examine the erroneous aſſertion,

Falſity of this origin.

* An Extract from the Divers works cited in the Note.

† Let thoſe who wiſh to be convinced of the diſcordancy of thoſe ſyſtems conſult CICERO *Quæſtiones Academ:—De Natura Deorum—De Legib.—De Finibus Boni et Mali.—De Off:* &c.— or LACTANTIUS *Inſtitut: Divin:*—or the laſt of the *Helvian* Letters; where the doctrines, the ſyſtems, and the abſurdities of our modern Sophiſters are compared with thoſe of the ancient ſages.

that the myſteries of Eleuſis had no other ſecre but the unity of God, and the pureſt morality.— How is it poſſible to ſuppoſe that thoſe myſteries were not univerſally known to the people, when it is certain that all the citizens of Athens were initiated into both the leſſer and greater myſteries, according to their age*? Nor do I aſk how it came to paſs, that theſe ſame Athenians under ground were all taught their catechiſm on the unity of God, and how when above ground they adored ſuch a multitude of Gods; or, again, how it happened that they condemned Socrates to death on the accuſation that he did not adore all the Gods; or elſe, why all the Prieſts of the different idols only acquired by their initiation new zeal for the defence of that multitude of Gods and their altars. In fine, I will not aſk how it is poſſible to perſuade oneſelf that thoſe Prieſts, ſo ardent and ſo zealous in their temples for the worſhip of Jupiter, of Mars, of Venus, and of ſo many other Deities, ſhould be the very perſons who aſſembled the people during the ſolemnity of the grand myſteries, to tell them that all their worſhip of the Gods was nothing but impoſture, and that they themſelves were the authors, miniſters, or prieſts of impoſture!

* See Mr. de St. Croix's work on *the Myſteries of the Ancients.*

I know

I know that ſuch reflections are more than ſufficient to ſtamp with falſehood the origin in which the learned Maſons glory. But let us for a moment ſuppoſe, that theſe myſteries were what they have repreſented them to be; the very pretenſion of a ſociety ſpringing from ſuch anceſtry and glorying in perpetuating their ſpirit and their Dogmas, —this pretenſion alone, I ſay, muſt claſs this Brotherhood among the moſt ancient conſpirators. It would entitle us to ſay to the Craft, 'Such then is the origin of your myſteries; ſuch the object of your Occult Lodges! You then deſcend from thoſe pretended ſages, and thoſe Philoſophers, who, reduced to the lights of reaſon, had no farther knowledge of the true God than what their reaſon inſpired. You are the children of Deiſm or Pantheiſm, and, replete with the ſpirit of your forefathers, you wiſh to perpetuate it! Like them you look upon every thing which the reſt of mankind have learned from the lights of Revelation, as ſuperſtition and prejudice. Every Religion which adds to the worſhip of the Theiſt or deteſts the Pantheiſt, in a word Chriſtianity and its myſteries, are with you objects of hatred and contempt! You abhor whatever the Sophiſts of Paganiſm, or the Sophiſts initiated in the myſteries of the idolatrous Prieſts abhorred;—but thoſe Sophiſts deteſted Chriſtianity, and ſhowed themſelves its moſt inveterate enemies. From your own

avowals, then, in what light can we view your myſteries, if not as a perpetuation of that hatred and of that wiſh of annihilating every other Religion but the pretended Deiſm of the Ancients?

'You alſo ſay that you are what thoſe Jews were, and ſtill are, who, for all their religious tenets, only acknowledge the unity of God (provided there have exiſted Jews who did not believe in the Prophets and in *Emmanuel* the Saviour).—You have then the ſame ſentiments toward the Chriſtian which the Jews have. Like them, you inſiſt on *Jehovah*, but to curſe Chriſt and his myſteries *.'

The

* As for this Jewiſh part of the Craft, or the Freemaſonry of the Jews, we recommend to our reader to peruſe the treatiſe of a moſt learned and zealous Maſon dedicated *Denen die es Verſtehen, or to thoſe who can underſtand.* He leaves no ſtone unturned throughout antiquity to prove the identity of the ancient myſteries of Eleuſis, of the Jews, of the Druids, and of the Egyptians, with thoſe of Freemaſonry. And indeed when we reflect on the pretended hiſtory of the name of *Jehovah* loſt by the aſſaſſination of Adoniram, it may be very probable that the Jews had had a part in Maſonry, "As it is "drawn from the *Chaldaic Paraphraſe*, and taken from a "fable invented by the Rabbins to rob Chriſt of his divinity "and power. They ſuppoſed, that Chriſt being one day in "the Temple of Jeruſalem had ſeen the Holy of Holies, "where the High Prieſt alone had a right to enter. That "he there ſaw the name of *Jehovah*—That he carried it "away with him—and that in virtue of this ineffable name

"he

The more the Maſonic works above-mentioned are read, the more conſpicuous will be the juſtice of the reproaches we make. With ſome, matter is eternal; with others, the Trinity of the Chriſtians is only an alteration of Plato's ſyſtem.—Others again adopt the follies of the Martiniſts, or of the ancient Dualiſm *. Nothing then can be more evident. All theſe learned Maſons who pretend to deſcend from the Egyptian Prieſts, from thoſe of Greece, or from the Druids, only ſeek to eſtabliſh what may appear to each to be the religion of nature. Nor do they vary leſs as to its tenets than did both the ancient and modern Sophiſters. They all agree in deſtroying faith in the minds of their adepts, by ſyſtems in direct oppoſition to Chriſtianity. If they do not run into wild declamation like Voltaire, Diderot, or Raynal, it is becauſe they wiſhed themſelves to deduce their conſequences. To have expreſſed them too openly would have been divulging their myſteries; but one muſt be more than ignorant not to comprehend their meaning—How can we be blind to

" he had wrought his miracles." (See the Voile Levé).—The whole of this Fable is evidently directed againſt the tenets of the Chriſtians on the Divinity of Chriſt. The importance which Maſons annex to the recovering of the name of Jehovah, and particularly all their myſteries in the degree of *Roſæ Crucis*, has the ſame object in view.

* See particularly the letter *Aux Illuſtres Inconnus*, or to the Real Freemaſons, 1782.

their intentions, when we peruſe the writings of thoſe who declare themſelves to have originated in the Templars, or in thoſe ſectaries who infeſted all Europe under the name of Albigeois? Theſe two ſources have more analogy between them than may be ſuppoſed. Let us examine them ſeparately, and then judge what we have to expect from men who glory in ſuch an origin.

Of Freemaſons attributing their origin to the Templars.

As to the Templars, let us even ſuppoſe that this famous order was really innocent of all the crimes which occaſioned its diſſolution; what object either religious or political can the Freemaſons have in perpetuating their myſteries under the name or emblems of that order? Had the Templars brought into Europe a religion, or a code of morality, that was not known? Is that their inheritance?—In that caſe neither your religion nor your morality can be that of Chriſt. Is it their fraternity, their charity, which is the object of your ſecrets? Did the Templars really add any thing to thoſe Evangelic virtues? Or is it the religion of *Jehovah*, or of the Unity of God, coinciding with the myſteries of Chriſtianity?—If ſo, why do you reject all *Chriſtians* who are *not Maſons*, as *prophane?*

It is too late to reply, that the alarms of religion are vain and ungrounded; that religion never was the object of the Lodges. What then is that name, that worſhip of *Jehovah*, which the learned Maſons

Maſons declare to have been handed down from the Knights Templars. Whether theſe Knights were the authors of it, or whether they received it by tradition, or borrowed it from the ancient myſteries of Paganiſm and of its ſages, this name I ſay, this worſhip cannot be foreign to Chriſtianity; and is not every Chriſtian entitled to ſay, 'You would not be ſo ſecret nor ſo ardent to revenge it, if it were ſimilar to the worſhip eſtabliſhed throughout the Chriſtian world?'

Should governments partake of the ſame alarms, to what ſubterfuge will the adepts have recourſe who have ſworn to avenge Liberty, Equality, and every right of their aſſociation, which has been ſo deſperately outraged in the deſtruction of the Templars? It will be in vain to aſſert the innocence real or fictitious of thoſe too famous Knights. That vow of vengeance which has been perpetuated for nearly five centuries can hardly fall on *Philip le Bel or Clement V.* or on the other Kings and Pontiffs who in the beginning of the fourteenth century contributed to the diſſolution of that order? Nor will it be renewed in theſe days on account of the ties of blood, or through any pity for the particular individuals of the order? This vow, this oath of vengeance muſt be inſtigated by other cauſes—It has been perpetuated as the very object, the very doctrine of the ſchool, as the principles and myſteries which the Maſons

have

have received from the Templars. What then can thoſe men thoſe principles be, which can only be avenged by the death of Kings and Pontiffs? And what are thoſe Lodges wherein for four hundred and fourſcore years this vow this oath of vengeance has been perpetuated?

It is evident: Nor is it neceſſary in this place to examine whether *Molay* and his order were innocent or criminal, whether they were the real progenitors of the Freemaſons or not; what is inconteſtable is ſufficient; it is enough that the Maſons recognize them for their anceſtors; then the oath of avenging them and every allegory recalling that oath decidedly points out an aſſociation, continually threatening and conſpiring againſt Religion and its Pontiffs, againſt Empires and their Governors.

But it may be aſked, what lights can hiſtory throw on ſuch an intimate connection between the myſteries of Maſonry and the order of Templars? Such a queſtion requires much reſearch, nor will I withhold from my reader the reſult of the inquiries which I have made on that ſubject.

Of the trials and depoſitions of the Templars.

The order of the Knights Templars eſtabliſhed by Hugo de Paganis, and confirmed by Pope Eugenius III. was originally founded with all that charity which Chriſtian zeal could inſpire, for the ſervice of thoſe Chriſtians who, according to the devotion of the times, went to viſit the Holy Land.

Land. At firſt mere Hoſpitallers, theſe Knights, following the manners of the age, ſoon acquired great celebrity by their exploits againſt the Saracens. Their firſt repute originated in the ſervices which were naturally to be expected from their great valor and eminent virtues: and ſuch is the general teſtimony which hiſtory bears in their favour, making a wide diſtinction between the former and latter part of their exiſtence. The Order ſoon ſpread through Europe, and acquired immenſe riches. They then began to forget their religious ſtate, courted only the celebrity of the field, and were no longer led to it by the ſame ſpirit. It is worthy of remark, that many years before their diſſolution, hiſtory already reproached them not only with being lax in their former virtue, but with thoſe very crimes which cauſed their deſtruction. In the very zenith of their glory, and at a time when it required much courage to upbraid them with their vices, we ſee *Matthew Paris* accuſing them of converting into darkneſs the lights of their predeceſſors, of having abandoned their firſt vocation for plans of ambition, pleaſure, and debauchery, and of unjuſt and tyrannical uſurpation. They were already accuſed of holding correſpondence with the Infidels, which rendered abortive all the plans of the Chriſtian Princes; they were accuſed particularly of having treaſonably communicated the whole of Frede-

ric

ric II.'s plan to the Soudan of Babylon, who, deteſting ſuch perfidy, informed the Emperor of the treachery of the Templars *. This teſtimony, to which the Hiſtorian may add many others, will ſerve to render leſs ſurprizing the cataſtrophe which befel this famous order †.

In the reign of *Philip le Bel*, two men who had been impriſoned for their crimes declared that they had ſome important diſcoveries to make concerning the Knights Templars. Such a declaration under circumſtances ſo peculiar could not be thought entitled to much credit; it ſufficed nevertheleſs to make the King determine on the diſſolution of the order, and he cauſed all the Templars in his kingdom to be arreſted on the ſame day. This ſtep may be thought too precipitate: But interrogatories and a thorough examination followed; and it is on thoſe proofs alone, and the authentic minutes of that examination, that the Hiſtorian is to found his judgment. If their avowals are perfectly free, numerous, and coincident with each other, not only in different tribunals, but in different countries, enormous as their crimes may have been, ſtill we are forced to believe them, or reject all hiſtory, and the juridical acts of the tribunals. Theſe juridical minutes

* See Matthew Paris, ann. 1229.

† See Abbas Viſpurgienſis in Chronica, an. 1227 & Sanut. Lib. III. Part 12, Cap. 17, &c. apud Dupuy Traité ſur la condamnation des Templiers.

have

have ſurvived the ravages of time, and their importance has cauſed them to be preſerved in great numbers. Let the Hiſtorian refer to the collection made by Mr. Dupuy, the King's librarian; I know no other way of forming one's judgment, and of diſſipating prejudices.

It has been ſaid, that *Philip le Bel and Clement V.* had concerted between them the diſſolution of the Templars. The falſity of ſuch an aſſertion is evident on the inſpection of their letters. *Clement V.* at firſt will give no credit to the accuſations againſt the Templars; and even when he receives inconteſtable proofs from *Philip le Bel*, he had ſtill ſo little concerted the plan with that Prince, that every ſtep taken by the one or the other occaſions diſputes on the rights of the Church or of the Throne.

It was alſo ſaid, that the King wiſhed to ſeize on the great riches of theſe Knights; but at the very commencement of his proceedings againſt the order, he ſolemnly renounced all ſhare in their riches; and perhaps no Prince in Chriſtendom was truer to his engagement. Not a ſingle eſtate was annexed to his domain, and all hiſtory bears teſtimony to the fact *.

We next hear of a ſpirit of revenge which actuated this Prince; and during the whole courſe of

* Layette, Tom. III. No. 13.—Rubeus Hiſt. Ravanenſis—Bzovius ann. 1308.—Marianna Hiſt. Hiſpanniæ.

this

this long trial, we do not hear of a ſingle perſonal offence that he had to revenge on the Templars. In their defence not the moſt diſtant hint either at the revengeful ſpirit, or at any perſonal offence againſt the King is given; ſo far from it, until the period of this great cataſtrophé the Grand Maſter of the order had been a particular friend of the King's, who had made him godfather to one of his children.

In fine, the rack and torture is ſuppoſed to have forced confeſſions from them which otherwiſe they never would have made; and in the minutes we find the avowal of at leaſt two hundred Knights all made with the greateſt freedom and without any coercion. Compulſion is mentioned but in the caſe of one perſon, and he makes exactly the ſame avowal as twelve other Knights, his companions, freely made *. Many of theſe avowals were made in *Councils* where the Biſhops begin by declaring that all who had confeſſed through fear of the torture ſhould be looked upon as innocent, and that no Knight Templar ſhould be ſubjected to it †. The Pope, *Clement V.* was ſo far from favouring the King's proſecutions, that he began by declaring them all to be void and null. He ſuſpended the Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Prelates, who had acted

* Layette, No. 20, Interrog. made at Caen.

† See the Council of Ravenna. Rubeus Hiſt. Raven. Lib. VI.

as

as inquiſitors in France. The King accuſes the Pope in vain of favouring the Templars; and *Clement* is only convinced after having been preſent at the interrogatories of ſeventy-two Knights at Poictiers in preſence of many Biſhops, Cardinals, and Legates. He interrogated them not like a Judge who ſought for criminals, but like one who wiſhed to find innocent men, and thus exculpate himſelf from the charge of having favored them. He hears them repeat the ſame avowals, and they are freely confirmed. He deſired that theſe avowals ſhould be read to them after an interval of ſome days, to ſee if they would ſtill freely perſevere in their depoſitions. He hears them all confirmed. *Qui perſeverantes in illis, eas expreſſe et ſponte prout recitatæ fuerant approbârunt.* He wiſhed ſtill further to interrogate the Grand Maſter and the principal ſuperiors, *præceptores majores*, of the divers provinces of France, Normandy, Poitou, and of the Tranſmarine countries. He ſent the moſt venerable perſons to interrogate thoſe of the ſuperiors whoſe age or infirmities hindered them from appearing before him. He ordered the depoſitions of their brethren to be read to them, to know if they acknowledged the truth of them. He required no other oath from them than to anſwer freely and without compulſion; and both the Grand Maſter and the ſuperiors of theſe divers provinces depoſe and confeſs the ſame things, con-

confirm them ſome days after, and approve of the minutes of their depoſitions taken down by public notaries *. Nothing leſs than ſuch precautions could convince him of his error: it was then only that he revoked his menaces and his ſuſpenſion of the French Biſhops, and that he allows the King to proceed in the trials of the Templars.

Let ſuch pretexts be forgotten, and let us only dwell on the avowals which truth alone forced from theſe criminal knights.

Reſult of their avowals.

Their depoſitions declare, that the Knights Templars on their reception denied Chriſt, trampled on the croſs, and ſpit upon it; that Good Friday was a day which was particularly conſecrated to ſuch outrages; that they promiſed to proſtitute themſelves to each other for the moſt unnatural crimes; that every child begotten by a Templar was caſt into the fire; that they bound themſelves by oath to obey without exception every order coming from the Grand Maſter; to ſpare neither ſacred nor prophane; to look upon

* Qui Magiſter & Præceptores Franciæ, Terræ ultra-marinæ, Normandiæ, Acquitaniæ ac Pictaviæ, coram ipſis tribus Cardinalibus præſentibus, quatuor tabellionibus publicis et multis aliis bonis viris, ad Sancta Dei Evangelia ab eis corporaliter tacta, præſteto juramento quod ſuper præmiſſis omnibus, meram et plenam dicerent veritatem, coram ipſis, ſingulariter, liberè ac ſpontè, abſque coactione qualibet et timore, depoſuerunt et confeſſi fuerunt. *(Epiſt. Clementis V. Regibus Angliæ, Galliæ, Siciliæ, &c.)*

every

every thing as lawful when the good of the order was in queſtion; and above all, never to violate the horrible ſecrets of their nocturnal myſteries under pain of the moſt terrible chaſtiſements *.

In making their depoſitions many of them declared they had only been forced into theſe horrors by impriſonment and the moſt cruel uſage; that they wiſhed, after the example of many of their brethren, to paſs into other orders, but that they did not dare, fearing the power and vengeance of their order. That they had ſecretly confeſſed their crimes and had craved abſolution. In this public declaration they teſtified by their tears the moſt ardent deſire of being reconciled to the church.

Clement V. convinced at length, conceives whence the treachery proceeded, of which the Chriſtian Princes ſo often complained they had been the victims in their wars againſt the Saracens. He permits the trials of the Templars to be continued, and a hundred and forty are heard in Paris. The freedom of their avowals.

All repeat the ſame depoſition, except three, who declare they have no knowledge of the crimes imputed to their order. The Pope, not content with this information taken by Religious and by

* See the Vouchers brought by Dupuy, and Extract of the Regiſters.

French Noblemen, requires that a new trial ſhould take place in Poitou before Cardinals and others whom he himſelf nominates: Again, with the ſame freedom and for the third time, the Grand Maſter and other Chiefs in preſence of Clement V. repeat their depoſitions. Molay even requeſted that one of the Lay Brothers who was about his perſon ſhould be heard, and this Brother confirms the declaration. During many years theſe informations were continued and renewed at Paris, in Champagne, in Normandy, in Quercy, in Languedoc, in Provence. In France alone above two hundred avowals of the ſame nature are to be found; *nor* did they vary in England, where at the ſynod of London, held in 1311, ſeventy-eight Engliſh Knights were heard, and two whole months were ſpent in taking informations and in verifying their declarations. Fifty-four Iriſh were alſo heard, and many Scotch, in their reſpective countries. It was in conſequence of theſe declarations, that the order of the Templars was aboliſhed in thoſe kingdoms, and that the Parliament diſpoſed of their goods *. The ſame declarations were taken and proved in Italy, at Ravenna, at Bologna, at Piſa, and at Florence, though in all theſe councils the Prelates were very ready to abſolve all thoſe Knights who could ſucceed in their juſtifications.

* Vide Valſinger in Edvardum II. et Ypodigma Neuſtriæ apud Dupuy.—Eſſai de Fred. Nicolai.

When

When I hear the crimes of this order called in queſtion, it appears to me that a ſufficient attention has not been paid to the multiplicity of the avowals of theſe Knights, and of the diverſity of nations which judged them. It would be one of the moſt extraordinary facts in hiſtory to ſee two hundred of theſe Knights accuſing themſelves of the greateſt abominations. It would be a ſtill greater atrocity to ſee ſo many Biſhops, Noblemen, Magiſtrates, and Sovereigns, of different nations, ſitting in judgment on the Templars, and publiſhing to the world, as free and uncontroled, declarations which had only been extorted from them by the fear of torture. Such a conduct would be ſtill more horrible than that of the Templars themſelves; and would it not be equally extraordinary to ſee ſo many different nations agreeing to uſe the rack to extort ſuch depoſitions from them? But for the honor of humanity ſuch means were not employed in the trials of the Templars, by the Biſhops and Grand Bailiffs, the King's Commiſſaries, the Cardinals, and Commiſſaries of Clement V. nor by himſelf in France. Such methods were not reſorted to by the councils nor by the tribunals of other nations. Never was a cauſe of greater importance pleaded; and, from the numerous and authentic documents which are ſtill extant, it is evident, that Judges never were more fearful of confounding the innocent with the guilty.

Let not the diſſolution of another celebrated order, though in a very different way, be objected. The Jeſuits were aboliſhed, but they were not brought to trial; not a ſingle member of the order has been heard in its defence, nor have any members depoſed againſt it. I ſhould be the firſt to condemn them, could proofs ſimilar to thoſe againſt the Templars, be adduced againſt them.

Let us for a moment ſuppoſe the Templars entirely innocent of the crimes imputed to them, what could have been the virtue and courage of an order, which could demean itſelf ſo much, as to make ſuch declarations againſt itſelf? How can the Free-maſons glory in ſuch an anceſtry, who, if their crimes were not monſtrous, muſt themſelves have been monſters of the baſeſt cowardice.

The vulgar may be led away by the tardy proteſtations of Guy and Molay; but do the vulgar ever diſtinguiſh between the obſtinacy of deſpair and that ſerene firmneſs and conſtancy which are the attendants on virtue? They are not aware that falſe honor, like truth, may have its martyrs. During three years Molay perſevered in his avowal, and he repeated it at leaſt three times; when he pretends at length to deny it, his expreſſions are thoſe of rage, and he throws down the gauntlet to whoever ſhall pretend to aſſert that he *had made any depoſition* againſt his order; at the place of execution he declares *that all that he had ſaid* againſt his

his order was falſe, and that if he deſerved death it was *for having accuſed his order falſely* both before the Pope and the King. Amidſt theſe contradictions, can the Hiſtorian receive ſuch proteſtations of innocence? Much leſs is he to attend to the popular fable of Molay having cited Philip le Bel and Clement V. to the tribunal of God within a year and a day, and that both the Pope and the King died within the year; for hiſtory not only varies as to the day, but even as to the year of Molay's execution *

As

* It has been ſaid to have taken place in the different years 1311, 1312, and 1313. The firſt of theſe dates appears to me to be correct, becauſe the execution of the Grand Maſter certainly took place while the Commiſſaries of the Pope were at Paris, and they only reſided there from Auguſt 1309 till May 1311. It is in vain to alledge the proteſt of the Abbot of St. Germain as Lord of the Manor againſt the execution of two Knights Templars on his land; for, ſuppoſing this regarded the execution of Guy and Molay, we have the anſwer to the proteſt in date March 1313, whereas Clement V. only died on the 20th April 1314; ſo that even in that caſe the citation muſt have been of no avail.

Boccacio, who is ſo often quoted on the death of Molay, does not ſo much as mention it. When people make ſuch a diſplay of what this author has ſaid concerning the conſtancy of the Grand Maſter and the other Templars executed at the ſame time, ſome attention ſhould be alſo paid to his commencing with ſaying, that "theſe Knights were ſtrangely fallen off, on account of their great riches, from their priſtine virtue; that they were ambitious, voluptuous, and effemi-

As a laſt reſource in defence of the order, the very nature and infamy of the crimes of which the Templars were accuſed have been alledged as a proof of their innocence. But moſt certainly the more infamous thoſe crimes, the more debaſed muſt have been the members of the order to accuſe each other of them. But all theſe crimes, however infamous and incredible, only ſerve to diſcover the abominable ſect which introduced them among their adepts, and from whom the Templars evidently learned their frightful myſteries. That

nate; that ſo far from making war in defence of the Chriſtians, according to their inſtitute, they left that duty to be diſcharged by people whom they had hired, or by valets; and that in the days of *Jaques Molay* their virtues had degenerated into vices." All that Boccacio ſays afterwards on the conſtancy and death of the Grand Maſter and his companions, which ſo greatly excites his enthuſiaſm, is ſolely grounded on the account his father gave him, who was a merchant and at Paris at that time; his ideas on the ſubject, as is eaſily perceived, are merely thoſe of the vulgar. I ſhall always return to the ſame point. Let us examine the authentic documents and the minutes of the proceedings. When they are to be had, and they ſtill exiſt in great numbers, they are real points by which we are to be guided. Such has been the line of conduct (the only ſatisfactory one) held by Mr. Dupuy, in his Treatiſe on the Condemnation of the Templars. This work is written with candor; and though he has not made the moſt of his proofs, he abounds in authentic documents and extracts from the minutes of the trials, and furniſhes far more than are neceſſary to ſatisfy our judgment.

hatred

hatred of Chriſt, that execrable immorality, even to the atrocious infanticide, all are to be found in the tenets, they are even in the principles of that incoherent medley of *Begards*, *Cathares*, and of that ſhoal of ſectaries which flocked from the Eaſt to the Weſtern States about the beginning of the eleventh century.

I would willingly aſſert that it was the ſmaller part of the Templars who ſuffered themſelves to be carried away by ſuch abominations. Some even at Paris were declared innocent. In Italy a ſtill greater number were abſolved; of all thoſe who were judged at the Councils of Mayence and Salamanca, none were condemned; and hence we may conclude, that of the nine thouſand houſes belonging to the order many had not been tainted, and that whole provinces were to be excepted from the general ſtain of infamy. But the condemnations, the juridical depoſitions, the method of initiating the knights, almoſt become general; the ſecrecy of their receptions, where neither Prince nor King, nor any perſon whatever, could be preſent during the laſt half century, are ſo many teſtimonies which corroborate the divers accuſations contained in the articles ſent to the Judges; that is to ſay, that at leaſt two thirds of the order knew of the abominations practiced, without taking any ſteps to extirpate them. *Quod omnes, vel quaſi duæ*

partes ordinis ſcientes dictos errores corrigere neglexerint.

This certainly cannot mean that two thirds of the Knights had equally partaken of theſe abominations. It is evident on the contrary, that many deteſted them as ſoon as they were acquainted with them; and that others only ſubmitted to them, though initiated, after the harſheſt treatment and moſt terrible threats. Nevertheleſs, this proves that the greateſt part of theſe Knights were criminal, ſome through corruption, others through weakneſs, or connivance; and hence the diſſolution of the order became neceſſary.

Another reflection which ſtrikes me as being of weight, though I do not know that any one has made it, is, that between thirty and forty thouſand Knights not only ſurvived the condemnation of the order, but alſo ſurvived Philip le Bel and Clement V. The greater part of theſe had only been condemned to canonical penance, to ſo many days faſting or prayer, or to a ſhort impriſonment.—They lived in different parts of the world, where they had nothing to fear from *their perſecutors and tyrants*. Conſcience, honour, and many other motives, ſhould have induced theſe ſurvivors to make their recantations after having made juridical depoſitions of ſuch an abominable nature againſt their order; moſt certainly if they had made them through fear or ſeduction, it was a duty incumbent

on

on them. Nevertheleſs, of thoſe thouſands of Knights heard in ſo many different ſtates there is not a ſingle one that makes his retractation, not one who leaves ſuch a declaration to be publiſhed after his death. What men then are theſe Knights? If their depoſitions be true, how monſtrous muſt that order have been by its crimes; if they be falſe, what monſters of calumny was it compoſed of? That fear may have made them ſwerve from truth during the reign of Philip le Bel, I will admit; but that King being dead, what becomes of ſuch a plea.

Such nevertheleſs are the men whom the Maſons glory in their deſcent from. Yes, and their deſcent is real. Their pretenſions are no longer chimerical. Were they to deny it we ſhould force them to recognize as their progenitors not the whole of the order, but that part whoſe ancient corruption and obſtinate hatred againſt the altar and the throne, when added to their thirſt of revenge, muſt render them ſtill more formidable to both Kings and Pontiffs.

Were we to trace the deſcent of the Freemaſons by the Templars, we ſhould not have the aſſurance of thoſe who ſuppoſe the Grand Maſter Molay, when in the Baſtile, creating the four *Lodges*, that of Naples for the Eaſt, of Edinburgh for the Weſt, of Stockholm for the North, and

and of Paris for the South *. Yet, following nothing but the archives of the Freemaſons themſelves, and the apparent affinities which ſubſiſt between them and the Knights Templars, we are entitled to ſay to them—'Yes, the whole of your ſchool and all your Lodges deſcend from the Templars. After the extinction of their order a certain number of criminal Knights, who had eſcaped the general proſcription, formed a body to perpetuate their frightful myſteries. To their pre-exiſting code of Impiety they added the vow of vengeance againſt Kings and Pontiffs who had deſtroyed their order, and againſt all Religion, which proſcribed their tenets. They formed adepts who were to perpetuate and tranſmit from generation to generation the ſame myſteries of iniquity, the ſame

* This account is to be found in an Almanac printed at Paris under the title of *Etrennes Intereſſantes* 1796-97. I don't know from whence the writer has drawn this anecdote, nor on what grounds he ſays that the Duke of Sundermania, as Grand Maſter of the Mother Lodge of the North, was acceſſary to the aſſaſſination of the King his brother by Anckarſtroëm. Though this writer ſhows ſome knowledge of the Craft, he is ſo ignorant in other reſpects that it is impoſſible to take him for an authority:—For example, he ſays, that the Jeſuits were Freemaſons, that it was they who poiſoned the Emperor Henry VII. and that Emperor died *two hundred years* before a Jeſuit exiſted. This fable of the Jeſuits Freemaſons is an artifice deviſed by the Illuminés, and we ſhall ſee them own to it, to avert the attention of ſtates from their own ſect and conſpiracies.

oaths,

oaths, and the ſame hatred againſt the God of the Chriſtians, Kings and Prieſts.—Theſe myſteries have deſcended to you, and you perpetuate their impiety, their oaths, and hatred.—Such is your origin. Length of time, the manners of each age may have varied ſome of your ſigns and of your ſhocking ſyſtems; but the eſſence is the ſame, the wiſhes, oaths, hatred and plots are ſimilar—You would not think it, but every thing betrayed your forefathers, and every thing betrays their progeny.'

Let us then compare the tenets, language, and ſigns. What a ſimilarity, and how many are common to both!

In the myſteries of the Templars, the initiator begins by oppoſing the God who cannot die to the God who dies on the croſs for the ſalvation of mankind. "Swear," he ſays to the candidate, "that you believe in *a God the Creator of all things*, "*who neither did nor will die*;" and then follow blaſphemies againſt the God of Chriſtianity. The new adept is taught to ſay, that Chriſt was but a falſe prophet, juſtly condemned in expiation of his *own* crimes and not of thoſe of mankind. *Receptores dicebant illis quos recipiebant, Chriſtum non eſſe verum Deum et ipſum fuiſſe falſum Propbetam; non fuiſſe paſſum pro redemptione humani generis, ſed pro ſceleribus ſuis* *: Can any one here miſtake the

* 2d Art. of their Avowals. See Dupuy, page 48.

Jeho-

Jehovah of the Maſons, or the *Jew of Nazareth led by Raphael into Judea to ſuffer for his crimes* *?

The God of the Templars, which *never could die*, was repreſented by the *head* of a man, before which they proſtrated themſelves as before their real idol. This head is to be found in the Maſonic Lodges in Hungary, where Free-maſonry has preſerved the greateſt number of its original ſuperſtitions †.

This head is to be found again in the *Magic Mirror* of the Cabaliſtic Maſons. They call it the Being of Beings, and reverence it under the title of SUM (*I am*). It repreſents their great *Jehovah*, ſource of all beings. And we may look upon it as one of the links which compoſe the general chain by which the Hiſtorian may connect the Hiſtory of Maſonry with that of the Templars.

* See above, page 312.

† See Kleiſer's Report to the Emperor Joſeph II. I never ſaw this Report written by Kleiſer, whom the Emperor Joſeph II. had ordered to get himſelf received, that he might know what he ought to depend upon with reſpect to the Maſons and Illuminés. The Report was printed by order of the Emperor; but the Free-maſons and Illuminés bought it up with ſuch rapidity, that ſcarcely a copy eſcaped them. I am acquainted with a Nobleman who has read and even made extracts from it; and it was through his means that I learned this anecdote concerning the head being preſerved in the Hungarian Lodges. It appears that ſome of the Templars revered it as the head of their firſt founder, while others worſhipped it, as the image of the God whom they adored.

Theſe

Theſe ſame Knights in hatred to Chriſt celebrated the myſteries of *Jehovah* more particularly on Good Friday, *præcipue in die Veneris Sancta*; and it is the ſame hatred which aſſembles the Roſicrucians on that day, according to their ſtatutes, to dedicate it more particularly to their blaſphemies againſt the God of Chriſtianity.

Among the Templars, Liberty and Equality was maſked under the name of Fraternity.

Qu'il eſt bon, qu'il eſt doux, de vivre en freres *.

was the favorite canticle during their myſteries. It has ſince been adopted by the Maſons, and is the maſk that conceals all their political errors.

The Templars were bound to ſecrecy by the moſt terrible oaths, ſubjected themſelves to the vengeance of the Brethren and to death itſelf, if ever they revealed the myſteries of the order. *Injungebant eis per ſacramentum, ne prædicta revelarent ſub pœna mortis.* The ſame oath ſubſiſts among the Maſons, and the ſame threats for any one who ſhall violate ſecrecy.

The precautions leſt any *profane being* ſhould be preſent at their myſteries are ſimilar. The Templars always began by ſending out of their houſes whoever was not initiated. Armed brethren were placed at the doors to keep off all curious people, and ſentries were placed on the roofs of their houſes, which they always called Temples †.

* How pleaſing, how happy it is to live like brethren. † Ibid.

Hence

Hence originates the *Brother Terrible, or the Tyler,* who ſtands at the doors with a drawn ſword, to defend the entrance of the Lodge againſt the prophane multitude. Hence that common expreſſion among Maſons the *Temple is covered,* to ſay the ſentries are placed; no prophane Being can gain admittance, not even by the roof, we may now act with full liberty. Hence alſo the expreſſion *it rains,* ſignifying the Temple is not covered, the Lodge is not guarded, and we may be ſeen and over-heard.

Thus every thing to the very ſymbols *, their language, the very names of *Grand Maſter,* of *Knight,* of *Temple,* even to the columns *Jachin and Boaz,* which decorated the Temple of Jeruſa-

* Without doubt there is a variety of other ſymbols which do not come from the Knights Templars, ſuch are the flaming ſtar, the ſun, the moon, and the ſtars. The learned Maſons in their ſecret journal of Vienna attribute theſe to the founder of the Roſicrucians, called Brother *Ros-Crux.* He was a Monk of the thirteenth century, who imported both his magic and myſteries from Egypt. He died, after having initiated ſome few diſciples, who for a long time formed a ſeparate aſſociation; they at length united with the Free-maſons, and formed one of their occult degrees. Or it would be more correct to ſay that there exiſts now a-days in this degree nothing more than the name and the magic art of the ancient Roſicrucians, with the ſtars and other ſymbols borrowed from the firmament. Every other part is confounded with, and merged in, the myſteries and plots of Maſonry.

lem,

lem, and which are ſuppoſed to have been given to the care of the Templars, all in a word betray our Free-maſons to be the deſcendants of thoſe proſcribed Knights. But what 'a damning proof' do we not find in thoſe trials, where the candidate is taught to ſtrike with his poniard the pretended aſſaſſin of their Grand Maſter *; in common with the Templars it is on Philip le Bel that they wreak their vengeance; and in every other King the ſect behold this pretended aſſaſſin. Thus with all the blaſphemous myſteries againſt Chriſt we ſee them perpetuating thoſe myſteries of vengeance, hatred, and combination againſt Kings. The Maſons then are correct when they claim the proſcribed Knights for their forefathers. The ſame plans, the ſame means, the ſame horrors could not be more faithfully tranſmitted from father to ſon.

We ſhall conclude this chapter by a few obſervations which will not leave any ſubterfuge to thoſe who may ſtill entertain doubts concerning the crimes that brought diſſolution on this proſcribed order. Let us ſuppoſe the whole of this order to have been perfectly innocent of all the accuſations of impiety, or of principles dangerous to governments. It is not in this ſtate of innocence that they are recognized by the Maſons as their

* See above, page 322.

fore-

foreſathers. The profound adepts only acknowledge the Templars as their progenitors, becauſe they are convinced that thoſe Knights were guilty of the ſame impiety and of the ſame plots as themſelves. It is in theſe crimes alone, and in theſe conſpiracies, that they recognize their maſters; and as infidels and conſpirators it is that they invoke them.*

Under what title do the Condorcets and the Syeyes, under what title does Fauchet or Mirabeau, Guillotin or Lalande, Bonneville or Volney, and ſo many others who are known to be at once the profoundeſt adepts of Maſonry and the heroes of Impiety and Revolutionary Rebellion—under what title can ſuch men challenge the Knights Templars as their progenitors, if not becauſe they believe that they have inherited thoſe principles of Liberty and Equality which are no other than hatred to Chriſt and hatred to Kings? When Condorcet, ſumming up the ſtudious reſearch of thirty years, falſifying all the facts of hiſtory, and combining all the cunning of Sophiſtry to extort our gratitude for thoſe *ſecret aſſociations deſtined to perpetuate privately and without danger among a few adepts*, what he calls *a ſmall number of plain truths, as certain preſervatives againſt the predominant prejudices*; when he extols the French Revolution as the triumph ſo long preparing and expected by theſe *ſecret ſocieties*; when he promiſes to ſolve the queſtion

queſtion hereafter, whether the Knights Templars, whoſe diſſolution was the ſummit of *barbarity and meanneſs, are not to be numbered among theſe aſſociations* *. When he holds ſuch language, under what point of view can the Knights Templars have inſpired him with ſuch deep concern? With him, theſe ſecret aſſociations, ſo deſerving of our gratitude, are thoſe of the pretended ſages, "indig- "nant at ſeeing nations oppreſſed, even in the "ſanctuary of their conſciences, *by Kings the ſu- "perſtitious or political ſlaves of the prieſthood.*" They are the aſſociations of thoſe *generous* men "who dare examine the foundations of all power "or authority, and who revealed to the people "the great truths, *that their Liberty is inalienable*; "*that no preſcription can exiſt in behalf of tyranny*; "*that no convention can irrevocably ſubject a nation* "*to any particular family: That Magiſtrates, what-* "*ever may be their titles, functions, or powers, are* "*only the officers, and not the maſters of the people:* "*That the people always preſerve the right of re-* "*voking thoſe powers emanating from them alone,* "*whether they judge it has been abuſed, or conſider* "*it to be uſeleſs to continue them. In ſhort, that the* "*people have the right of puniſhing the abuſe as well* "*as of revoking the power* †."

* Eſquiſſe des Progres, &c. Epoque 7.

† Ibid. Epoque 8.

Thus we ſee Condorcet tracing back the germ at leaſt of all the principles of the French Revolution to theſe *ſecret aſſociations*, which he repreſents as the benefactors of nations, and as preparing the triumph of the multitude againſt the altar and the throne. All therefore he does or promiſes to do in future, when he propoſes the queſtion, whether the Knights Templars are not to be numbered among thoſe ſecret aſſociations, can only originate in the hope of tracing to them principles, oaths, and means which in time would operate ſimilar revolutions. All this zeal of Condorcet for the ſecret aſſociation of the Templars, is no other than the hopes of finding them guilty of that ſame hatred againſt Royalty and the Prieſthood with which his own heart is inflamed.

The ſecret which he has half diſcloſed more daring adepts have betrayed; it has eſcaped them amidſt their declamations. In the delirium of fury, and in the cavern as it were of their regicide trials, they publicly invoke the *reeking dagger*, they exclaim to their brethren, "Let the interval "of ages diſappear and carry nations back to the "perſecutions of Philip le Bel—*You who are or* "*are not Templars*—help a free people to build "in three days and for ever, a Temple in honor "of Truth—*May tyrants periſh*, and may the "earth be delivered from them*!"

* Bonneville Eſprit des Religions, p. 156, 157, 175, &c.

Such

Such then is the explanation which the profound adepts give of the myſterious names of *Philip le Bel* and of the Templars. The firſt recalls to their mind, that in all Revolutions Kings are to be immolated, and the ſecond, that there exiſted a ſet of men leagued in the oath of delivering the earth from its Kings. That is what they call reſtoring Liberty to the people, and building the Temple of Truth!—I had long feared to exaggerate the depravity and the plots of the proſcribed Knights; but what crimes can hiſtory impute to them which are not comprehended in this terrible invocation of the adepts at the dawn of the Revolution? It is when they grow more daring, and ſtimulate each other to thoſe crimes which overthrow the altar and the throne; it is at that period that the moſt furious adepts, at once Maſons and Jacobins, recall the name and the honor of the Templars to be avenged, and their oaths and plots to be accompliſhed. The Templars were then, what the Jacobin Maſons are at this day; their myſteries were thoſe of the Jacobins.—It is not to us that objections are to be made on this accuſation. Let the profound adepts of Maſonry and Jacobiniſm defend their own aſſertions; let the offspring be perſuaded that they have wronged their forefathers: And even could that be demonſtrated, ſtill it would be evident that the myſteries of the Occult Lodges conſiſt in that

hatred of the altar and the throne, and in thoſe oaths of rebellion and impiety, which the adepts extol as their inheritance from the Templars. Still it would be evident that the oath (the eſſence of Jacobiniſm) of overturning the altar and the throne is the laſt myſtery of the Occult Maſons, and that they only recognize the Templars as their progenitors, becauſe they believed the myſteries of thoſe famous though proſcribed Knights contained all the principles, oaths, and wiſhes which operated the French Revolution.

CHAP. XIII.

Farther Declarations of the Free-maſons as to their Origin.

The real Founder of Maſonry.—True and firſt Origin of their Myſteries and of all their Syſtems.

THE learned adepts were not miſtaken when they numbered the Knights Templars in the anceſtry of Free-maſons. We have ſeen by the comparative ſtatement of their myſteries how much they coincided with each other; but it ſtill remains to be ſhown whence the Templars had received their ſyſtems of impiety. This obſervation has not eſcaped thoſe of the adepts who gloried ſo much in the impiety of their myſteries. They have extended their reſearches with that view, to aſcertain whether there had not exiſted ſome of *thoſe ſecret aſſociations* in Europe whence they might trace their origin prior to the Templars. The Sophiſter, the famous adept ſhall ſpeak. The reſult of his reſearches are only announced; death cut the thread of thoſe ideas which he had promiſed to develop in the extenſive work he was

meditating on the *progreſs of the human mind*, and of which his admirers have only publiſhed the general plan under the title of *Eſquiſſe d'un Tableau general ſur les Progrès de l'Eſprit humain (Sketch of a general Table of the Progreſs of the Human Mind)*. But in this Sketch we find more than ſufficient to diſſipate the remaining cloud, and to rend the veil which as yet the adepts had not thought prudent entirely to withdraw. The text of this famous adept ſhall be laid before the reader: a very few reflections will then ſuffice to lead us to the fountain head whence ſprung all the myſteries and ſyſtems of Free-maſonry, and to develop to its full extent the true ſpirit with which it is actuated.

" In the South of France, ſays our Sophiſti-
" cated and Maſonic Adept, whole provinces unit-
" ed to adopt a Doctrine more ſimple, a Chriſti-
" anity more pure, where man, ſubject only to the
" Deity, judged according to his own lights what
" the Deity had pleaſed to reveal in the books
" emanating from him.

" Fanaticiſed armies, led by ambitious Chiefs,
" devaſtated theſe provinces. Executioners led
" by Legates and Prieſts immolated thoſe who had
" eſcaped the fury of the ſoldiery; a tribunal of
" Monks was eſtabliſhed, who were to condemn
" to the flames all that were ſuſpected of hearken-
" ing to the dictates of reaſon.

" They

" They nevertheleſs could not hinder this ſpirit " of Liberty and reſearch from gaining ground. " Overpowered in the ſtate where it had dared to " appear, and where more than once intolerant " hypocriſy had combated it with ſavage war, it " would reproduce and ſpread itſelf in a neigh- " bouring country. It was to be found at all " times until that period when, ſeconded by the " invention of printing, it grew in power ſuffi- " ciently to deliver a great part of Europe from " the yoke of the Court of Rome.

" At that time there exiſted a claſs of men, " who, deſpiſing all ſuperſtitions, were content " ſecretly to deſpiſe them, or who at moſt took " the liberty of making them, now and then, the " objects of their ſarcaſtic wit; the more ſtinging " as they were worded in terms of the utmoſt " reſpect."

As a proof of this ſpirit of Philoſophiſm or Impiety at that period, Condorcet cites the Emperor Frederic II. his Chancellor Peter de Vigne, the works entitled LES TROIS IMPOSTEURS *(the three Impoſtors)*, LES FABLIAUX and the DECAMERONE DI BOCACIO; it is then that he adds thoſe words already cited in the preceding chapter, but neceſſary to be repeated, " We will examine whether " at a time when Philoſophic Proſelytiſm would " have been attended with danger, *ſecret aſſocia-* " *tions were not formed, deſtined to ſpread and per-*

" *petuate privately and without danger, among a* " *few adepts, a ſmall number of ſimple truths as* " *certain preſervatives againſt the predominant pre-* " *judices.*

" We will examine whether that celebrated " order (the Templars), againſt which the Popes " and Kings ſo barbarouſly conſpired, are to be " numbered among theſe aſſociations *."

I will avail myſelf of this indication of Condorcet. Thoſe *men of the South*, among whom he promiſed to ſeek the origin of theſe ſecret aſſociations, are known. They are that motley crew followers of Manes, who during many ages, ſpreading from the Eaſt into the Weſt, inundated France, Germany, Italy, and Spain at the time of Frederic the Second; they are that horde of ſectaries known by the names of *Albigeois, Cathares, Patarins, Bulgares, Begards, Brabanters, Navareſe, Bearneſe, Coteraux, Henriciens, Leoniſts*, &c. &c.; in fine, ſectaries who, under a hundred different and uncouth names, recall to the mind of the reader every thing that had been broached by the moſt direful enemies of morality, government, and the altar, and that had *as yet* appeared in Europe. I have ſtudied their tenets in their divers ramifications. I have viewed that *monſtrous whole* of all the *Jehovahs* which Maſonry could invent. In

* Eſquiſſe d'un Tableau, &c. Epoque 7.

their

their twofold principle is to be found the twofold God of the Martiniſt and Cabaliſtic Maſon. In the diverſity of their opinions is to be found the concord of Eclectic Maſonry againſt the God of Chriſtianity. In their principles are to be ſeen the germ and explanation of the moſt infamous myſteries of the Occult Lodges, and of their forerunners the Templars. They declare the fleſh to have been created by the evil ſpirit, that they might have the right of proſtituting it. All is in the direct line of ſucceſſion, the Cathares, the Albigeois, the Knights Templars, and our Jacobins of the Occult Lodges, all proceed from the ſame parental ſtock. This is ſtill more evident when we conſider their diſorganizing principles of Liberty and Equality, which declare that no ſubmiſſion is due *to the Spiritual or Temporal powers.*— This was the diſtinctive mark of the Albigeois; it was by this diſtinction they were pointed out to the Magiſtrates as the perſons amenable to the laws enacted againſt the ſect. Let us follow them.

At that period when the multitude of their ſectaries empowered them, with arms in their hands, to triumph over their opponents, we ſee them reſorting to all the frantic rage of Jacobinized Maſonry againſt the very name of Chriſtian. Even before the ſpiritual and temporal authorities had united their efforts to ſubdue their ſavage rage, they had already exerciſed all the cruelties and fero-

ferocities of a Robeſpierre: Jacobin like, they went *beating down the churches and the religious houſes, maſſacreing without mercy the widow and the fatherleſs, the aged parent and the infant child, making neither diſtinction of age nor ſex; and, as the ſworn enemies of Chriſtianity, ravaged and deſtroyed every thing both in Church and State.**

When

* All this would be amply proved had we publiſhed our Memoirs on Ancient Jacobiniſm. In the mean time our readers may conſult what remain of the cotemporary writers or who lived ſoon after, for the opinions and actions of theſe ſectaries. Such for example as Gläber, who witneſſed their firſt appearance at Orleans 1017; Reinier, who was one of their adepts during ſeventeen years; and Philichdorf, Ebrard, and Hermangard, who lived with them. They may alſo conſult St. Antoninus, Fleuri, Collier, Baronius; but above all let the Councils which condemned theſe ſects be attended to, and their decrees compared with hiſtory; and then will vaniſh many falſe prejudices imbibed againſt the means adopted both by church and ſtate for the irradicating of thoſe ſectaries, who, truly Jacobins, aimed at the abſolute deſtruction of all civil ſociety, and of Chriſtianity itſelf. How is it poſſible to doubt of the tendency of their diſorganizing Liberty and Equality, when we know that the proof neceſſary and pointed out to the Judges for the conviction of theſe ſectaries, conſiſted in ſhowing that the accuſed was one of thoſe who held that *no obedience was due to the civil or ſpiritual powers, and that no authority was entitled to puniſh any crimes.* Such is preciſely the doctrine of the Council of Taragone, to know whether the famous degrees of the third and fourth Councils of Lateran are applicable to the accuſed—*Qui dicunt poteſtatibus eccleſiaſticis vel ſæcularibus non eſſe obediendum et pœnam corporalem non eſſe*

When at length the public authority had triumphed over theſe ferocious ſectaries, they ſhrunk back into their dens or Occult Lodges, and reduced

eſſe inſligendam in aliquo caſu et ſimilia (Concil. Tarag. anno 1242). How then can it be aſſerted, that the furies of theſe ſectaries were only in repriſal of the Cruſade publiſhed againſt them, when we ſee that the very firſt decree iſſued in this cruſade was preciſely to rid Europe of their rebellious principles, and of the cruelties which they were already exerciſing in the ſtates of Thouloufe under the title of *Coteraux*, in Biſcay under that of *Baſques*, and in many other countries under different names, *Brabantionibus, Aragonenſibus, Navarriis, Baſcolis, Coterellis*, et *Triaverdinis, qui tantam in Chriſtianos immanitatem exercent, ut nec Eccleſiis nec Monaſteriis deferant, non viduis non pupillis, non ſenibus et pueris* nec cuilibet parcant *ætati aut ſexui, ſed more Paganorum omnia perdant et vaſtent* (Conc. Lateran. 1179). Such nevertheleſs is the firſt motive ſtated and the firſt decree iſſued of this famous cruſade. What have Robeſpierre and the other Jacobins done more to deſerve it?

It is inconceivable how much people have been miſtaken both with reſpect to this decree and to that iſſued on the ſame ſubject by the fourth Œcumenical Council of Lateran, anno 1215. They were repreſented as the church aſſuming the power of depoſing Sovereigns, as uſurping all civil and temporal power. And ſuch is the interpretation given to thoſe very decrees which hindered the Jacobins of thoſe days from executing the very plans which our cotemporaries have carried into effect againſt the altar, the throne, and all civil ſociety! Had I but leiſure for digeſting the materials I have collected, both the church and her councils would be amply avenged of ſuch a calumny. I hope hereafter to publiſh a particular diſſertation on that ſubject, and to be able to ſhow how

ced themſelves again to ſecret aſſociations. Then they had their oaths, their occult doctrines, their ſigns and their degrees, as the Occult Maſons have their

how ſtrangely thoſe decrees have been miſconceived, from a want of knowing the hiſtory of thoſe times and of the men againſt whom they were iſſued.—Let us ſuppoſe for an inſtant Philip D'Orleans, in virtue of the oath of allegiance common in the Fendal Syſtem, ſummoning all his vaſſals to follow him and unite with his Jacobins in the deſtruction of the throne, of the laws, of all ſociety and of religion; will any man of ſenſe believe the vaſſals to be bound, by their oath, to carry arms under and to follow Philip's ſtandard and thus ſecond his antiſocial conſpiracy? Is it not evident on the contrary, that no oath can bind ſubjects to ſupport ſuch a war, that all oaths are null, which can only be fulfilled by the deſtruction of the throne, the annihilation of the laws, and of the baſis of all civil ſociety; that in ſuch a poſition, it is the cauſe of the ſovereign, of the laws, and of ſociety, that is to be defended in ſpite of all oaths? Well, I will pledge myſelf to prove that the famous decrees of the Councils of Lateran againſt the *Albigeois* were no more than a ſimilar deciſion, that, ſo far from encroaching on the authority of Kings, they were iſſued in their defence, in defence of their perſons, of their authority, of the laws, and of civil ſociety; that had it not been for thoſe decrees both ſovereignty and the empire of the laws would long ſince have been at an end.

I ſhould have numerous errors to combat, and one in particular which I ſhall not forget. I know there are men ſo much biaſſed in favour of the Albigeois and the Vaudois, as to repreſent them as the anceſtors of the Anglican Church, in proof of its antiquity. Such were the pretenſions of the Engliſh Editor of the tranſlation of *Moſheim's* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

their perfect maſters; and their apprentices were only admitted partially to the ſecrets *.

In future we may diſpenſe with Condorcet's reſearches on the ſecret aſſociations of theſe famous ſectaries. That is not the point to be ſought for in their hiſtory. We know they had their oaths, their ſigns, their ſecret language, their fraternity, their propaganda, and, above all, *ſecrets which a father could not reveal to his children, nor a child to a parent; ſecrets which a brother could not mention to his ſiſter, nor the ſiſter to her brother* †.

What is the moſt remarkable is the coincidence pointed out by Condorcet between the myſteries

Hiſtory. *(See his notes on the articles Vaudois and Albigeois).* Though the cauſe of the Anglican Church is not my own, ſtill I will ſerve it better than all thoſe feeble writers.—I will avenge it of the ſhame of ſuch an origin. I will prove, that, ſo far from deſcending from the Vaudois, they openly condemned their diſorganizing principles both before and after the reign of Henry VIII. and that there never exiſted the leaſt connection between it and the Albigeois. It is the excluſive privilege of the Jacobins, and Condorcet's ſecret aſſociations, to deſcend from and glory in ſuch progenitors.

* Eſt valde notandum quod ipſe Johannes et Complices ſui, non audent revelare prædictos errores credentibus ſuis, ne ipſi diſcedant ab eis—Sic tenebant Albanenſes, exceptis ſimplicioribus quibus ſingula non revelabantur *(Reinier de Cataris Lugduni & Albanenſes.)* Such are exactly the ſecrets of the firſt and of the Occult Lodges, of the ſimple dupes and of the conſummate adepts.

† Philichdorf, *contra* Waldenſes, Chap. 13.

of

of the ſectaries, thoſe of the Templars, and thoſe again of the ſecret aſſociations of our days. We know whence the ſectaries of the South ſprung; we know their common father; if he is to be the progenitor of Freemaſonry, the ſtock is not honourable. To be ſure it will trace the Maſonic myſteries back to the immenſe ſpace of ſixteen centuries, but if this origin be true the adept need not glory in it. Hiſtory has ſpoken clearly. The true parent of the *Albigeois*, of the *Cathares*, *Begards*, *Bulgares*, *Coteraux and Patarins*, of all thoſe ſects in fine mentioned by Condorcet, is the ſlave ſold to the Paleſtine widow; it is the ſlave *Curbicus*, more generally known under the name of *Manes*. It is not we who have traced the Maſonic Lodges and their myſteries to this ſlave; it is Condorcet; he is the perſon to be blamed by the adepts. We were ſorry to reveal ſo humiliating an origin; but we only raiſed the veil pointed at by Condorcet. He had ſeen that ſlave, indignant at the fetters which diſgraced his youth, ſeeking to revenge himſelf on ſociety for the baſeneſs of his origin. He heard him preaching liberty, becauſe he had been born in ſlavery; preaching equality, becauſe born in the moſt degraded claſs of the human ſpecies. Cordorcet did not dare ſay that the firſt Jacobin Maſon was a ſlave; but he pointed out the offspring of Curbicus in the ſectaries of the South, in the order of the

the Templars. He has ſhown the brethren, who have inherited from theſe ſectaries and the Templars, to be the adepts in Maſonry, and that was ſufficiently ſaying that they all ſprung from one common parent.

But let us beware of deciding on this ſingle proof. If the myſteries of Maſonry really are to be traced back to Manes, if he be the true father, the founder of the Lodges, we are firſt to prove it by his tenets, and then by the ſimilarity and conformity of their ſecrets and ſymbols. We beg the reader's attention to the following comparative ſtatement; the reſult will not be unimportant to hiſtory, and it particularly intereſts thoſe who are to watch over the welfare of nations.

I. With reſpect to tenets, till the exiſtence of Eclectic Maſonry, that is to ſay, till the Impious Sophiſters of the age introduced into the rites of the Lodges their impious myſteries of Deiſm and Atheiſm, no other God, no other *Jehovah* is to be found in the Maſonic code but that of Manes or the univerſal Being, ſubdivided into the *God* Good and the *God* Evil. It is that of the Cabaliſtic Maſonry, and of the ancient Roſicrucians; it is that of the Martiniſts, who ſeem to have only copied Manes and his Albigeois adepts. A moſt extraordinary fact is, that in an age when the Gods of Superſtition were to diſappear before the Gods of our modern Sophiſters, the God of Manes ſhould have

have preſerved his aſcendancy in ſo many branches of Maſonry.

II. At all times the follies of the Cabal, and of Magic founded on the diſtinction of this twofold God, had been received in the Maſonic Lodges.—Manes alſo made magicians of his Elect *.

III. Manes in particular is the founder of that religious fraternity which the Occult Maſons interpret into a total indifference for all religion.—That Hereſiarch wiſhed to gain over to his party men of every ſect; he preached that they all tended to the ſame end, and he promiſed to receive them all with the ſame affection †.

IV. But above all, what we ſhould particularly attend to, and compare both in the code of Manes and of the Occult Lodges, are the principles of diſorganizing Liberty and Equality. That neither Princes nor Kings, ſuperiors nor inferiors might exiſt, this Hereſiarch taught his adepts, that all laws and all magiſtracy was the work of the evil principle ‡.

V. Leſt there ſhould be either poor or rich, he inculcated that the whole belonged to all, and that

* Magorum quoque dogmata Manes novit, et in ipſis volutatur. *(Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes ex Auguſtino.)*

† V. Baronius in Manetem.

‡ Magiſtratus civiles et politias damnabant ut quæ a Deo malo conditæ et conſtituæ ſunt. *(Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes, Tom. II. in Manetem.)*

no

no perſon had the right of appropriating to himſelf a field, a houſe, &c *.

Such doctrines muſt naturally have ſuffered many modifications in the Occult Lodges as well as among the diſciples of Manes. He aimed at the abolition of all laws and of Chriſtianity, at the eſtabliſhment of Liberty and Equality, by means of ſuperſtition and fanaticiſm; our modern Sophiſters were to give his ſyſtems a new direction, that of their impiety. The Altar and the Throne were equally to be victims to them; and Liberty and Equality, in oppoſition to Kings and to God, were the laſt myſteries of Manes, as they are of our modern Sophiſters.

VI. The ſame conformity is to be found between the degrees of the adepts before they are initiated in the profound ſecrets. The names are changed; but Manes had his *Believers*, his *Elect*, and his *Perfects*. Theſe latter were impeccable, that is to ſay, abſolutely free; becauſe no violation of any law could inculpate them †. Theſe three degrees correſpond with thoſe of *Apprentice*, *Fellow-craft*, and *Perfect Maſter*. The name of *Elect* has been preſerved in Maſonry, but it conſtitutes the fourth degree.

* Nec domos, nec agros, nec pecuniam ullam poſſidendam. (Ibid. Ex Epiphanio & Auguſtino.)

† Hieronimus, Præmium Dialogorum contra Pelagium.

VII. The ſame terrible and inviolable oaths bound the diſciples of Manes as bind the adepts of the Occult Lodges, to keep the ſecrets of their degree. St. Auſtin had been admitted to the degree of *Believer* nine years, without being initiated into that of *Elect*—"Swear or forſwear yourſelf, "but be true to your ſecret," was their motto *.

VIII. The ſame number and almoſt identity of ſigns. The Maſons have three which they call the *ſign*, the *gripe*, and the *word*. The Manichæans alſo had three, that of the *word*, of the *gripe*, and of the *breaſt* †. This latter was ſuppreſſed on account of its indecency; it can be traced to the Templars; the other two are ſtill extant in the Lodges of Maſonry.

Every Maſon who wiſhes to know whether you *have ſeen the light*, begins by offering his hand to know whether you are acquainted with the gripe. It was preciſely by the ſame method that the Manichæans recognized each other, and felicitated a brother on having ſeen the light ‡.

* Jura, perjura, ſecretum prodere noli. *(Auguſtinus de Manichæis.)*

† Signa, oris, manuum et ſinus. *(Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes ex Auguſtine.)*

‡ Manichæorum alter alteri obviam factus, dexteras dant ſibi ipſis ſigni cauſa, velut a tenebris ſervati. *(Ibid. ex Epiphanio.)*

IX. If

IX. If we penetrate into the interior of the Maſonic Lodges, we ſhall find repreſentations of the ſun, of the moon, and of the ſtars. Theſe are nothing more than Manes's ſymbols of his *God* GOOD whom he brings from the ſun, and of the different genii which he diſtributed in the ſtars. If the candidate is only admitted into the Lodge blindfold, it is becauſe he is yet in the empire of darkneſs, whence Manes brings his *God* EVIL.

X. I do not know whether any of the Maſonic adepts are ſufficiently informed of their own genealogy to know the real origin of their decorations, and of the fable on which the explanations of the Occult Degrees are founded. But the following is a ſtriking proof of their deſcent from Manes. In the degree of Maſter every thing denotes mourning and ſorrow. The Lodge is hung in black, in the middle is a *Sarcophagus* reſting on five ſteps, covered with a pall. Around it the adepts in profound ſilence mourn the death of a man whoſe aſhes are ſuppoſed to lie in this tomb. This man is at firſt ſaid to be Adoniram, then Molay, whoſe death is to be avenged by that of all tyrants. The allegory is rather inauſpicious to Kings; but it is of too old a date not to be anterior to the Grand Maſter of the Templars.

The whole of this ceremonial is to be found in the ancient myſteries of the diſciples of Manes. This was the ceremony which they called *Bema*.

They alſo aſſembled round a *Sarcophagus* reſting on five ſteps, decorated in the like manner, and rendered great honors to him whoſe aſhes it was ſuppoſed to contain. But they were all addreſſed to Manes. It was his death that they celebrated; and they kept this feaſt preciſely at the period when the Chriſtians celebrated the death and reſurrection of Chriſt *.

The Chriſtians frequently reproached them with it; and in our days the ſame reproach is made to the Roſicrucians, of renewing their funeral ceremonies preciſely at the ſame time, that is, on the Thurſday in Holy Week †.

XI. In the Maſonic games *Mac Benac* are the two words which comprehend the ſecret meaning of this myſtery. The literal ſignification of theſe words, we are told by the Maſons, is, *the fleſh parts from the bone.* This very explication remains a myſtery, which only diſappears when we reflect on the execution of Manes. This Hereſiarch had promiſed by his prayers to cure the King of Perſia's child, on condition that all the doctors were diſmiſſed. The young Prince died and Manes

* Plerumque Paſcha nullum celebrant—Sed Paſcha ſuum, id eſt diem quo Manichæus occiſus, quinque gradibus inſtructo tribunali, et precioſis linteis adornato, ac in promptu poſito, et objecto adorantibus, magnis honoribus proſequuntur. *(Auguſt. contra Epiſt. Manich.)*

† See Mr. Le Franc's Degree of Roſicrucian.

fled;

fled; but, falling again into the hands of the King, he was flayed alive with the points of reeds *. Such is the clear explanation of *Mac Benac*, the fleſh leaves the bones, *he was flayed alive* †.

XII. The very reeds bear teſtimony of the fact. People are ſurprized at ſeeing the Roſicrucians begin their ceremonies by ſeating themſelves ſorrowfully and in ſilence on the ground, then raiſing themſelves up and walking each with a long reed in his hand ‡. All this is eaſily explained again, when we reflect that it was preciſely in this poſture that the Manichæans were uſed to put themſelves, affecting to ſit or lay themſelves down on mats made of reeds, to perpetuate the memory of the manner in which their maſter was put to death §. And it was for this reaſon that they were called *Matarii*.

Epiph. Baronius, Fleuri, &c.

† Were it objected, that every thing in this degree appears grounded on the ſtory of Adoniram and Solomon's Temple, I would anſwer, Yes, as to words; but as to facts nothing relating to the death of Adoniram is to be found in the Hiſtory of Solomon or of his Temple. All is allegorical, and entirely applicable to Manes. The *Mac Benac* is inapplicable to the Templars. Beſide, the whole of this ceremony is far anterior to them. They may have ſhaped the fable according to their own profeſſion; but they have preſerved the leading feature, the Mac Benac, which carries us back immediately to Manes.

‡ Mr. Le Franc's Degree of Roſæ Crucis.

§ Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes, Baronius, &c.

Were we to continue our comparative ſtatement we ſhould meet with many other ſimilarities; we ſhould find, for example, that Fraternity ſo much extolled by the Craft, and which would be deſervedly applauded were it not confined ſolely to their own body. A ſimilar reproach was made to the Manichæans, that they were always ready to ſuccour one of their own ſect, but extremely hard on the poor of other deſcriptions *.

The ſame zeal for the propagation of their myſteries is alſo obſervable in both. The modern adepts glory in their Lodges being ſpread all over the world. Such alſo was the propagating ſpirit of Manes and of his adepts. Addas, Herman, and Thomas went by his orders to eſtabliſh his myſteries, the firſt in Judea, the ſecond in Egypt, and the third in the Eaſt, while he himſelf preached in Perſia and Meſopotamia. Beſide, he had twelve Apoſtles, though ſome ſay twenty-two; and in a very ſhort ſpace of time we ſee his doctrines, like the Freemaſons, ſpreading all over the world †.

Attending only to the moſt ſtriking ſimilarities, we have ſeen the Occult degrees of Maſonry founded on the *Bema* of the Manichæans. It was

* Quin et homini mendico, niſi Manichæus ſit, panem et aquam non porrigunt. (*Auguſtinus de Moribus Manichæorum et contra Fauſtinum.*)

† Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes ex Epiphanio.

Manes

Manes whom they were to avenge on all Kings, on Kings who had condemned him to be flayed alive, and who, according to his doctrines, had only been inſtituted by the evil ſpirit; and the word to be recovered was that doctrine itſelf, to be eſtabliſhed on the ruins of Chriſtianity. The Templars, taught by the adepts diſperſed throughout Egypt and Paleſtine, ſubſtituted, at their diſſolution, their Grand Maſter Molay for Manes, as the object of their vengeance; and the ſpirit of the myſteries and the allegory remained the ſame. It is always Kings and Chriſtianity that are to be deſtroyed, Empires and the Altar to be overturned, in order to re-eſtabliſh the Liberty and Equality of human nature.

The reſult of theſe reſearches are certainly not flattering to the Craft; it traces the origin of their Lodges and of their doctrines on Liberty and Equality to a ſlave flayed alive for his impoſtures. However humiliating ſuch an origin may be, ſtill ſuch muſt be the reſult of the reſearches of him who ſeeks the ſource whence all their myſteries are derived. Their Occult ſecrets are all founded on this man who is to be avenged, and on that word or doctrine which is to be recovered in their third degree. The whole of this third degree is an evident repetition of the *Bema* of the Manichæan degree of *Elect*, the famous Mac Benac is clearly explained by the ſpecies of puniſhment inflicted on Manes, and every thing leads us back to

the Paleſtine widow's ſlave *. We may defy the Maſons to find any ceremony ſimilar to their's of *Mac Benac* either before or ſince the *Bema* of the Manichæans, if it be not the *Bema* itſelf; it is to that therefore that we muſt refer back; it is there we muſt reſt to find the ſource of the Maſonic myſteries.

The ſilence obſerved on this origin by the moſt learned Maſons proves that they were aſhamed, but not that they were ignorant of it. It muſt at leaſt have been difficult for them to have ſo often in the myſteries of the cabal commented on the *Jehovah* of Manes, ſubdivided like their own, into the *Good* and *Evil* principle, without knowing the grand author of this ſyſtem, and who has given his name to the ſect of the twofold God; without recognizing him, otherwiſe ſo famous as a profound adept in all the myſteries of the cabal, or of magic and aſtrology.

* Will not this circumſtance of the Widow explain a cuſtom with the Maſons, who, when they find themſelves expoſed to any danger, and that they have hopes of being heard by any of the brethren, in order to make themſelves known and to obtain ſuccour they hold their hands on their heads and call out, *help from the children of the widow?* If the modern Maſons are ignorant of the fact, the ancient adepts were well acquainted with it; and all hiſtory aſſerts that Manes was adopted by the widow to whom Budda, Scythian's diſciple, fled for refuge, and that the Hereſiarch inherited all the riches he had left her. *Help from the children of the widow*, therefore naturally alludes to the children of Manes.

It

It could hardly be poſſible for the Hero of the Martiniſts not to have ſeen that his Apocalypſe was nothing but the Hereſiarch's code. It cannot be ſuppoſed that Condorcet, tracing the origin of the ſecret aſſociations, and bringing the Templars ſo near to the *Albigeois*, could have been ignorant of what all hiſtory aſſerts, that the *Albigeois* and all the ramifications of thoſe ſects of the South (the *Vaudois* excepted) were really no other than Manichæans; beſide, that all thoſe infamous proceedings of the Templars had long ſince been attributed to the children of Manes; and that all thoſe horrors are eaſily explained by his doctrines.

When we ſee the principal adepts of Maſonry, ſuch as Lalande, Dupuis, Le Blond, De Launaye, ſeeking to ſubſtitute the errors of the Manichæans and of the Perſians, to the myſteries of the Chriſtian religion, it is ſtill more difficult to believe that they had not furniſed the real author of their myſteries *.

It may be poſſible that the Hiſtory of the Templars and of their Grand Maſter, as more intereſting to the adepts, may have obliterated the remembrance of ſo humiliating an origin.

The object of our reſearches has not been to humble the Maſonic body, but to develop the

* See Remarks on the general and particular Hiſtory of Religion, by Mr. Le Franç.

ſnares

ſnares of a ſect juſtly branded with infamy from the very firſt days of its exiſtence. Our object is particularly to make men ſenſible at length how much it intereſts both religion and the ſtate to inveſtigate the grand object of a ſecret aſſociation ſpread throughout the univerſe, an aſſociation whoſe ſecret is beyond a doubt contained in thoſe two words *Liberty and Equality*, confided to the adepts in the very firſt degrees of Maſonry; of an aſſociation whoſe laſt myſteries are no more than the explanation of theſe words to the full extent which the Jacobinical Revolution has given to them.

The hatred which a ſlave had conceived for his bonds makes him invent the words *Liberty and Equality*. The deteſtation of the condition in which he was born makes him believe that the evil ſpirit alone could have been the Creator of thoſe Empires which contain Maſters and Servants, Kings and Subjects, Magiſtrates and Citizens. He declares Empires to be the work of the Evil ſpirit, and he binds his diſciples by an oath to deſtroy them. He at the ſame time inherits the books and all the abſurdities of a Pagan Philoſopher, a great Aſtrologer and Magician, and compoſes his code, a monſtrous digeſt of theſe abſurdities, and of the hatred he had conceived againſt the diſtinctions and laws of ſociety. He creates myſteries, diſtributes his adepts into different claſſes or degrees

grees and eſtabliſhes his ſect. Though juſtly puniſhed for his impoſtures, he leaves them his execution as a new motive to ſtimulate their hatred againſt Kings. This ſect ſpreads itſelf from the Eaſt to the Weſt, and by means of its myſteries perpetuates and propagates itſelf. It is to be met with in every age. Cruſhed a firſt time in Italy, France, and Spain, it ſpreads anew from the Eaſt in the eleventh century. The Knights Templars adopt its myſteries, and the diſſolution of that order lends a pretence to new-model their games. The hatred of Kings and of the God of the Chriſtians is only ſtimulated by theſe new motives. The times and manner of the age may vary the forms or modify the opinions, but the eſſence remains; it is always the pretended light of Liberty and Equality to be diffuſed; it is the Empire of pretended Tyrants, whether religious or political, of Pontiffs, of Prieſts, of Kings, of Chriſt himſelf, which are to be deſtroyed, in order to re-eſtabliſh the people in that twofold Equality and twofold Liberty, which proſcribes the religion of Chriſt and the authority of Kings. The degrees and myſteries are multiplied and precautions are redoubled leſt they ſhould be betrayed; but their laſt oath is always hatred to the God who died on the Croſs,—hatred to the Monarch ſeated on the Throne.

Such

Such is the hiſtorical ſketch of Maſonry, and the main point of its ſecrets. Let the reader compare the proofs we have adduced from the very nature of its degrees, the proofs taken from the diſſertations of the moſt learned adepts of the moſt zealous Maſons on their myſteries; all thoſe, in fine, which we have drawn from their various opinions on the origin of their aſſociation; and I do not think he can entertain any doubt as to the grand object of this inſtitution. Let him then reflect on the manner in which we were led back by Condorcet from the Maſons of the day to the ſlave Curbicus, and how we diſcover in this Hereſiarch and his adepts the real authors of the code and myſteries of Freemaſonry; and I do not apprehend that he can any longer entertain a doubt as to their firſt and real progenitors.

Still it remains for us to ſhow how theſe ſame myſteries promoted the plans of the Sophiſters of Impiety united with thoſe of Rebellion, in the execution of their plots for effecting the grand Revolution. But let us not terminate this chapter without repeating our proteſtations in favor of the immenſe number of Maſons who have never been initiated in the Occult Myſteries of the ſect. Let us admire the wiſdom of Engliſh Maſonry in rejecting all thoſe degrees where an explanation of the myſteries begins to develop their dangerous principles. Let us admire and applaud them for having

having transformed this conſpiring ſect of other ſtates into an aſſociation evidently uſeful to their own. The more ſtrongly we have inſiſted on the importance to all Empires of inveſtigating the dangerous principles of the Occult Lodges, the better pleaſed and the more ready we are to do juſtice to thoſe whom we have ſeen ſo generally adopting the principles of a benevolent Equality, and of a Liberty ſecured by ſubjection to the laws.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Sixth Degree of the Conſpiracy againſt Kings.

Coalition of the Sophiſters and of the Freemaſons.

THE generality of Freemaſons of the preſent day do the Scotch the honour of looking upon their Grand Lodge as the ſtock whence all the others ſprang: It is there, they tell us, that the Templars convened for the preſervation of their myſteries: it is thence that they ſuppoſe Maſonry ſpread through England into France, Germany, and other ſtates. This is not an improbable conjecture with reſpect to the actual form*, and preſent

* I ſay with reſpect to the *actual form of their Lodges*, and not as to the ſubſtance of their myſteries; for there had exiſted Freemaſons long ſince in England who pretended neither to deſcend from the Knights Templars nor the Grand Lodge in Scotland. This is to be ſeen in a manuſcript written two hundred and ſixty years ago and ſtill preſerved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. This manuſcript is a copy of certain queſtions written about a hundred years before by Henry VI. in his own hand. The date then of the original is about three hundred and thirty years back, as Henry VI. departed this life in 1471. *(See Mr. Locke's Letter and this Manuſcript in W. Preſton's Illuſtrations of Maſonry, Book III. Sect. 1.)*

There

ſent aſpect of their myſteries, but, from whatever part they may have ſpread throughout Europe, it is an undoubted fact, that Lodges exiſted in France

There are two important remarks to be made on this manuſcript. Firſt, that the adept queſtioned on the origin of Maſonry makes no mention of the Templars; on the contrary he ſays, that all the important ſecrets of which it is in poſſeſſion were brought into Europe by Venetian merchants coming from the Eaſt. *(Comed ffyrſte ffromme the eſte ynn Venetia —3d anſwer.)* Locke ſuſpects that in thoſe times of *monkiſh* ignorance, the Maſons might have miſtaken the Venetians for the Phenicians. Mr. Locke could not have choſen a more unfavourable moment for his ſuſpicion, as the Maſons and even *the Monks* had by means of the cruſades learned to diſtinguiſh between the *Phenicians* and *Venetians*, and particularly between *Tyr* and *Venice*—Nothing was more natural than the anſwer made by the Maſon to Henry VI. 'That the myſteries had been brought from the *Eaſt* by the *Venetians*.' All Maſons agree that the Templars learned them in the *Eaſt*. It is very natural that the *Venetians*, ſo famous in thoſe days for their commerce in the Eaſt, ſhould have taken theſe myſteries whence the Templars afterwards did, and whoſe hiſtory had not yet been incorporated with that of Freemaſonry. But the reader will remark, that every thing leads us back to Manes, to the countries whence, it is well known, the ſect and its myſteries ſpread into Europe.

The ſecond obſervation to be made on this ancient Manuſcript is, that even in England Freemaſonry already comprehended all thoſe ſyſtems of *Cabal*, of *Aſtrology*, and of *Divination*, ſciences all founded on the twofold principle of Manes. The art of living *without fear or hope* is alſo to be remarked, the grand object of Manes, as well as of all impious wretches; the

France and in moſt other ſtates in the beginning of this century.

First obſtacles to the propagation of Maſonry.

In 1735 they were proſcribed by an edict of the States of Holland; two years later they were prohibited in France by Lewis XV.; and in 1738, Clement the XII. publiſhed his famous Bull of excommunication againſt them, afterwards renewed by Benedict XIV. In 1748, they were proſcribed in Switzerland by the Council of Berne.

From the very nature of their myſteries, this aſſociation could long reſiſt the ſtorms by which it was aſſailed. Men trained to the art of hiding themſelves had no other precautions to take than to avoid the publicity of large aſſemblies. It was in the very nature of their tenets that they found the greateſt obſtacles to their propagation. England, it is true, diſguſted with a Liberty and Equality which the civil feuds of its Lollards, Ana-

the art of making perfection and true liberty conſiſt in diſbelieving a future ſtate, which may conſtitute the hopes of the juſt man and the terror of the wicked. And this is confounded in the general terms of the Manuſcript—*The art of wunderwerckynge, and of foreſayinge thynges to comme—the ſkylle of becommynge gude and parfyghte wythouten the holpynges of* FERE *or* HOPE (*8th anſwer*). Amidſt all the panegyrics beſtowed on Maſonry in this ancient record ſuch are the documents contained in it. Though ſo much extolled by Maſons, the reader will certainly not receive it as a proof of the pretended innocence of their myſteries.

baptiſts,

baptiſts, and Preſbyterians had taught it to appreciate, had rejected from its Maſonic games all explanations tending to the overthrow of Governments; but it did not clear itſelf of all the adepts who ſtill remained attached to the diſorganizing principles of the ancient myſteries. It was this ſpecies of adept that preſerved the greateſt zeal for the propagation of its tenets; it was ſome of theſe who, wiſhing to attract Voltaire into their party, had made Thiriot write, that notwithſtanding the title of *Liberty and Equality* given to his Letters, he did not go to the point.

Unfortunately for France and for the reſt of Europe, ſuch was the ſpecies of adepts which took the lead in the propagation of their myſteries—*at firſt their progreſs was ſlow and imperceptible.*—It had coſt Voltaire much to adopt their diſorganizing principles, and it would neceſſarily coſt many young men much more, who, not having ſtifled all ſentiments of religion, repreſſed not only that ſpirit of independence but even that of curioſity and the deſire of knowing a ſecret only to be acquired by an oath which might be perjury in itſelf.

In France particularly it muſt have been difficult to inculcate myſteries, whoſe laſt ſecret was apoſtaſy and rebellion, in men as yet unaccuſtomed to declamations againſt Sovereigns and the ſocial order. Policy at firſt, and afterwards the progreſs

of the Sophiſters, removed every difficulty. The Freemaſons, according to cuſtom, ſought to gain an aſcendancy over the mind of ſome man who might protect them againſt and avert the indignation of the Sovereign; and with the apron they requeſt the Prince Conti to accept the title of Grand Maſter of the French Lodges. The Prince conſented to be initiated, and on that occaſion the conſtruction was put upon the myſteries which is artfully given whenever a candidate is received, whoſe ſentiments, rank, or grandeur, is known to militate againſt the diſorganizing principles of Liberty and Equality. Many Princes and ſome Sovereigns fell into a ſimilar error. The Emperor Francis I. would alſo be initiated; and he protected the brethren, who never revealed any ſecret to him which could ſhock his known piety. Frederic II. was alſo a Freemaſon. The adepts told him all their ſecrets againſt Chriſt, but guarded againſt the moſt diſtant hint of applying Liberty and Equality to the rights of the throne, which he was ſo jealous of maintaining.

In fine, the policy of the craft went ſo far as to gain protectors even among the Princeſſes by initiating them in the leſſer myſteries. Maria Charlotte, at preſent Queen of Naples, believed, without doubt, that ſhe was only protecting moſt faithful ſubjects; ſhe petitioned in favour of the proſcribed brethren, who were even in danger of ſuffering.

fering. A medal ſtruck on the occaſion, her health drank with that of the Grand Maſter at the Maſonic feaſts, appeared to be an infallible pledge of the gratitude of the Craft: and under her auſpices they ſpread far and near. But when the Conſpiracy burſt forth at Naples this protected brotherhood were found to be a neſt of conſpiring Jacobins. The plot had been contrived in their Lodges, and the protecting Queen ſtood foremoſt on the liſt of proſcriptions.

Many Lords and Noblemen, true and accepted Maſons, had joined in the conſpiracy; but the Court ſoon diſcovered the *occult* plot, in which it had been decided that all the Nobles, though Jacobin Maſons, ſhould be maſſacred immediately after the Royal Family by the equal and clouted-ſhoed brethren.

In animadverting on theſe facts, of which the Hiſtorians of the Revolution will have to treat hereafter, my deſign is to draw the attention of my reader to that policy of which ſo many great perſonages have been the miſerable dupes. The Occult Maſons would go in queſt of them, and initiate them in all the myſteries againſt religion.—The initiation of theſe Noblemen quieted the fears and averted the attention of Government from the Lodges, ſeeing them frequented by men who were the natural allies of the throne. And this policy of the Occult Lodges proved one of the moſt ſuc-

ceſsful tools for their ſucceſs. The names of the moſt faithful ſervants of the crown ſcreened the rebellious plots of their occult myſteries; and that of *Conti* eaſily quieted Lewis XV. with reſpect to the Maſons. The Police of Paris made no farther enquiries, and the Lodges were tolerated. The Sophiſters and the progreſs of Impiety furniſhed them with new and more efficacious means of multiplying their Lodges.

According as Voltaire and Holbach's club ſucceeded in inundating Europe with their impious writings, the Craft extended its conqueſts. It was then eaſy for the Philoſophiſts to make themſelves be liſtened to by men already diſpoſed to the ſecret myſteries by their Antichriſtian and Antimonarchical publications, and to inſpire them with a deſire of a new order of things to be learned in their Lodges. Curioſity, ſtimulated by impiety, daily made new converts to the ſect. Impiety continued propagated and ſpread wide the ſpirit and faſhion of Maſonry, and that was the great ſervice rendered to it by the Sophiſters of the age.

On their ſide, the Sophiſters of Impiety and Rebellion ſoon perceived the connection between the myſteries of Maſonry and their Philoſophiſm. They were deſirous of being acquainted with thoſe myſteries whoſe profound adepts were their moſt zealous diſciples; and ſoon all the French Philoſophiſts became Maſons. Many years before the Revo-

Revolution, it was difficult to meet with a Sophiſter who was not a Freemaſon. Voltaire alone had not been initiated. The Craft had too great obligations to him; it was indebted to him for too many of their adepts, not to teſtify their gratitude to him. Scarcely had this octogenary infidel arrived at Paris when they prepared the moſt pompous *fête* for his admiſſion to the myſteries. At eighty years of age he was *admitted to the light*. After having taken the oath, the ſecret which flattered him the moſt to learn was, that the adepts, in future his brethren, had long ſince been his moſt zealous diſciples. That their ſecret conſiſted in that *Liberty and Equality* which he had himſelf oppoſed to the Goſpel of his God and to the pretended Tyrants of the Earth. The Lodge reſounded with ſuch applauſe, the adepts rendered him ſuch honours, and he ſo perfectly felt the cauſe of them, that, thinking his pride gratified and his vow of hatred accompliſhed, he blaſphemouſly exclaimed, *This triumph is well worth that of the Nazareen.* The ſacred formula of the myſteries was ſo dear to him, that the ancient adept Franklin, having meanly preſented him with his children to bleſs, he only pronounced over them the words *Equality and Liberty*

Voltaire received a Freemaſon.

See the life of Voltaire.

If, after all the proofs we have given of the meaning attached to thoſe words by the profound adepts, any one ſhould doubt of their application to Chriſt and the throne, let him reflect on the interpretation of them given by Voltaire to the Geneveſe; and particularly what extent he gave them on his admiſſion among the brethren of *Liberty and Equality:* let him be carried back to this initiation, let him behold the crowned adept, thoſe who crown him, and thoſe who ſurround him, and can any other proof be required of the object of their myſteries than the liſt of theſe attendant brethren. There on the ſame line he would behold Sophiſters and Maſons, and particularly thoſe who by their writings have prepared the downfall of the Altar and the Throne, who by their votes have decreed it, and by their crimes have conſummated ſo iniquitous an undertaking. There he would meet the impious brethren, ſuch as Voltaire, Condorcet, Lalande, Dupuis, Bonneville, Volney, and all the other blaſphemers both modern and ancient; there again would he ſee the rebellious brethren, a Fauchet, Bailly, Guillotin, La Fayette, Menou, Chapellier, Mirabeau, and Syeyes; there in the ſame Lodge he would find the adepts of Holbach's club, and thoſe of *Philip L'Egalité.* Whence this concord, what object can unite ſo many *impious* brethren, ſo many *rebellious* brethren in the ſame Lodge, if not the identity of their ſecret myſteries?

ries? and why this concourſe of the Sophiſters to the Maſonic Lodges, if not for the mutual ſuccour they are to afford each other?

It was not ſufficient for the heroes of the Encyclopedia to unite under their ſtandards againſt Chriſt the infidels of the court and of every claſs. Many in all claſſes who had remained faithful to their God were alſo true to their King. Even in the impious part of the Ariſtocracy many men were to be found, whom fortune, ambition, or cuſtom attached either to the perſon or to the exiſtence of the Monarch. There exiſted a public force, which the duty or intereſt of its chiefs might oppoſe to their machinations; and a multitude of Citizens might have riſen againſt the Conſpirators.

But however numerous the diſciples of impiety may have been, ſtill the multitude ſided with the altar and the throne. The Sophiſters ſaw they had not as yet ſufficiently triumphed over the public opinion; they felt that it was neceſſary to acquire ſtrength.

Having long meditated on the arts of rebellion, they ſoon perceived what advantages might be drawn hereafter from the Maſonic Lodges. From the period of their coalition a revolution was made in the French Maſonry, the adepts of which ſoon became the children of the Encyclopedia. The Martiniſts alone, with ſome few Cabaliſtic

Lodges, remained true to their ſlave Curbicus; all others adopt the impiety of Voltaire. The real ſource of the myſteries was to be traced by the forms preſerved; but it was at this period that all thoſe novelties were introduced which make it more difficult to trace them. It was on this coalition that all our Dualliſt Maſons were transformed into Atheiſts, Deiſts, or Pantheiſts. It was then that the degrees of *the Knights of the Sun and of the Druids* were added to the former ones; but they are nothing more than the impious degrees of modern Sophiſtry.

Be they however children of Manes, or the offſpring of the Encyclopedia, it was always the ſame hatred againſt the altar and the throne, the ſame conſpiracy which conſtituted the grand object of the Occult Lodges. To ſecure the triumph of Holbach's club, the Sophiſters had only to aſſure themſelves of the ſupport of the pikes *; and by means of the interior intercourſe of the Maſonic Lodges they hoped to effectuate it. At the head of this correſpondence was a general office called the *Grand Orient*, apparently under

* I hope the reader will remark here, that the ſwearing in of the multitude is the laſt ſtep of a conſpiracy, and not the firſt, as ſome (little verſed in theſe black arts) are perpetually repeating; and that as long as the authors remain undiſcovered, it is but of little avail to diſcover the vulgar and often miſlead agents. T.

the

the direction of the Grand Maſter, but really conducted by the moſt profound adepts. This was the ſeat of Government, the high tribunal where all the Maſonic differences or ſuits were ſettled; it was alſo the ſupreme council whoſe orders could not be violated or diſobeyed without incurring the penalties of perjury.

Government of the Lodges.

It was to this tribunal that the different Lodges ſpread throughout the country ſent their deputies, who, reſiding there, were entruſted with the forwarding of orders, and with notifying their execution. Every Lodge had its preſident called the *Venerable*, whoſe duty conſiſted in forwarding the orders of the *Grand Orient*, or in preparing the brethren for the orders they were to receive. All inſtructions were tranſmitted in a ſecret language, in a particular cypher, or by private means. Leſt any falſe brother or Maſon, not ſubject to the inſpection of the *Grand Orient*, ſhould intermix with the real adepts without being diſcovered, there was a watch-word which changed every quarter, and was regularly ſent by the *Grand Orient* to every Lodge under its inſpection.

Every branch of this government was bound by the oaths of not revealing to the prophane the ſecrets of Freemaſonry. Each Lodge ſent its contributions quarterly for the maintenance of the central office, and to cover all expences which this office judged neceſſary to be incurred for the general

neral intereſt of the craft. Thoſe Lodges that were not under the inſpection of the *Grand Orient*, were under a ſimilar government of a Mother Lodge, which alſo had its Grand Maſter and kept the ſame ſort of correſpondence.

This part of their conſtitutions was generally known to all the brethren; but I have often repeated that with reſpect to the Occult Lodges they were in the dark. The day was to come when the greateſt novice in the art was to ſhow as much zeal as the moſt profound adept. To effectuate this, it was only neceſſary to fill their ordinary Lodges with hair-brained young fellows, ignorant citizens, and even thick-headed workmen, who had been previouſly miſled by the impious doctrines of the Sophiſters, and with all thoſe who were carried away by that torrent of declamation, calumnies, &c. directed againſt the altar, the throne, and all the higher orders of ſociety.

With ſuch a ſpecies of brethren the Occult Myſteries were unneceſſary, and without any further inſtructions the warhoop of Liberty and Equality was more than ſufficient to excite their enthuſiaſm and direct their blows. A chief in each Lodge, or a very few adepts in direct correſpondence with the central office of the Conſpirators, might eaſily be informed of the day and hour on which it was neceſſary that the minds of theſe underling adepts ſhould be worked up to revolutionary

tionary fury, and to point out the objects and perſons on whom they were to vent their rage. Nor was it impoſſible to organize thoſe bands of *Brigands* and firebrands into Lodges, and thus diſtribute to each the different parts of levelling butchers and of revolutionary executioners. Theſe Lodges, multiplied throughout the ſtate in the towns and villages, might, under the direction of the central office or committee, turn out at the ſame inſtant all over the country, thouſands and tens of thouſands of adepts all enthuſiaſtically arrayed under the banners of Liberty and Equality, armed with pikes, hatchets, and torches, carrying fire and deſolation wherever their courſe was traced, knowing beforehand what victims were to be ſacrificed, what caſtles and country houſes to be burnt, and what heads to be carried before the triumphant levellers of Liberty and Equality; thus preſerving the moſt exact accord in the midſt of rebellion, levelling at one blow all public force, all public juſtice, diſorganizing every thing and throwing every thing into confuſion. But, in order to eſtabliſh its new empire and organize its own power, it only had to transform its ſecret dens of conſpiracy into Jacobin clubs, and its grand adepts into municipal officers. Thus at length, it gave birth to a Revolution irreſiſtible, conſummated, and irreparable even in the firſt hours of its exiſtence,

ence, and before any one had thought of meaſures to oppoſe it.

In thus deſcribing what might have been done by means of that tenebrous ſecrecy of the Maſonic government and Lodges, I have only anticipated what really was done by the Sophiſters to effectuate the French Revolution. As early as the year 1776 the central Committee of the *Grand Orient* inſtructed the directing adepts to prepare the Brethren for inſurrection, and to viſit the Lodges throughout France, to conjure them by the Maſonic oath, and to announce that the time was at length come to accompliſh *it* in the death of tyrants.

Deputies ſent from the *Grand Orient.*

The adept who was intruſted with the viſitation of the Northern provinces was an officer of artillery called Sinetty. His Revolutionary Apoſtleſhip led him to Lille. The regiment of La Sarre was at that time in garriſon there. The Conſpirators wiſhed particularly to gain proſelytes among and make ſure of the military brethren; Sinetty was far from ſucceeding according to his wiſhes; but the method and plans he adopted are all that can be neceſſary for our object. To explain this matter to our readers, we will lay before them the relation made by one of the officers of La Sarre, an eye-witneſs, and one of the many whom Sinetty had choſen to be preſent at the meeting where

where he was to diſcloſe the object of his Apoſtleſhip.

" We had," ſaid this worthy officer to me, " our Lodge. It was to us, as to moſt other re- " giments, a mere plaything. The trials to which " the new candidates were ſubjected afforded us " much amuſement. The Maſonic feaſts made us " ſpend our leiſure hours agreeably, and refreſhed " us from our labors. You very well underſtand " that our *Liberty and Equality* was not that of the " Jacobins. The greateſt part and nearly the " whole of the officers gave proofs of this at the " Revolution. We indeed little thought of any ſuch " Revolution when an officer of artillery called " Sinetty, a famous Maſon, preſented himſelf at " our Lodge. He was received as a brother. At " firſt he did not appear particular. A few days " after he invited about twenty of us to meet him " at a tea-garden called the Bonne Aventure, a " little out of Lille. We thought he wiſhed to " return the compliment of the feaſt we had given " him, and expected a common Maſonic repaſt, " when on a ſudden he holds forth, declaring he " had important ſecrets to communicate from the " *Grand Orient.* We liſten to him; but judge of " our ſurprize when we heard him in the moſt " emphatic and enthuſiaſtic tone declare, 'That " at length the time was come, that the plans ſo " ably conceived and ſo long meditated by the

" true

" true Maſons were on the eve of being accom-
" pliſhed; that the univerſe would be freed from
" its fetters; Tyrants called Kings would be van-
" quiſhed; religious ſuperſtitions would give way
" to light; Liberty and Equality would ſucceed
" to the ſlavery under which the world was op-
" preſſed; and that man would at length be *re-*
" *inſtated in his rights.*'

" While our orator continued theſe declama-
" tions we ſtared at each other, as much as to
" ſay, 'What is this madman about?' We hear-
" kened to him for a whole hour, and ſilently;
" meaning afterwards to joke among ourſelves.
" What appeared to us the moſt extravagant was
" the confident manner in which he aſſerted, that
" it would be vain in future for Tyrants or Kings
" to pretend to oppoſe their vaſt plans; that the
" Revolution was infallible and near; and that
" the altar and the throne would be overturned *.

" He ſoon perceived that we were not Maſons
" of his ſtamp, and left us to go and viſit other

* Nothing perhaps can ſhow the danger and impolicy of oaths of ſecrecy more than this paſſage: For, any rebel, provided he be bound by the ſame oath, may come and make propoſitions to you of the moſt dangerous tendency; and if, through weakneſs or depravity, they are hearkened to, he finds Conſpirators ready made; if rejected, they are ſtill kept ſecret by thoſe who are ſuppoſed to be bound to ſecrecy, forgetting that in this caſe by the very act they become perjured to their oath of allegiance and to their God. T.

" Lodges,

" Lodges. After having laughed for ſome time " at what we conceived to be the conceits of a " heated brain, we forgot the ſcene till the Re- " volution (which convinced us but too forcibly " how much we had miſconceived the man) re- " called it to our minds."

When I had determined on publiſhing this fact, I knew how neceſſary it would be to authenticate it by the ſignature of him to whom we are indebted for the above account; but it may eaſily be conceived that he did not wiſh to have been looked upon as having betrayed the ſecrets of the Lodge. Fortunately there are now in London many who were preſent at that meeting; for example, the Comte de Martange, Mr. de Bertrix, Mr. Le Chev^r de Myon, all formerly officers in the regiment of La Sarre. Though I have not the honor of their acquaintance, and that they may be a little ſurprized at ſeeing themſelves named here, ſtill I am not afraid of being contradicted by them, either as to the miſſion or the manner in which Sinetty fulfilled it; and eſpecially when I add that it was their attachment to their King which miſled them with reſpect to this deſigning madman. So far were they from any revolutionary ideas, ſo well did they know the diſpoſitions of the French officers, and ſo firmly did they think the authority of the King eſtabliſhed, that they believed this Sinetty to be a madman, and all his meſſage from the

the Maſter Lodge to be no more than the reveries of a heated brain. Now, that the Revolution has diſſipated the illuſion, I leave the hiſtorian and the reader to meditate on ſo important a fact. The conſequences flow of themſelves. They manifeſt all that the brethren, either Sophiſters or Maſons, coaleſced in their central committee, expected from the choſen adepts which they had ſent into the provinces to prepare the inſurrection. But it was reſerved to Syeyes and Condorcet to eſtabliſh in the very centre of Freemaſonry an Apoſtleſhip much more general, whoſe object was to Jacobinize not the Lodges only but the whole Univerſe.

Eſtabliſhment of the Maſonic Propaganda.

That Condorcet, whom we have obſerved ſo jealous of fraternizing with the *Albigeois*, *Patarins*, or *Catares*, in ſhort, with all the Jacobins of the middle age, had, without doubt, ſtudied their means. What hiſtory relates of them, to inflame the indignation of the reader, is exactly what he adopted and imitated of their abominable artifices; and he even ſurpaſſed them *. That zeal ſo common

* Notwithſtanding I have already given various proofs of the coincidence between the modern Jacobins and thoſe of the middle ages, I think it proper to lay before my reader an hiſtorical fragment very precious, though little known. It is a letter written in 1243, by one Yvon of Narbonne to Gerald Archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, and preſerved by Matthew Paris, a cotemporary author. In this letter Yvon ſays, that, accuſed of leaning towards the Errors of the *Patarins*, he thought it prudent

mon to the adepts did not appear active and ardent enough for him. He joined with Syeyes to found in Maſonry itſelf a true Apoſtleſhip of Jacobiniſm. The

prudent to ſeek ſafety in flight. Arrived at Come, in Italy, he meets with ſome *Patarins*, and declares himſelf to be perſecuted for profeſſing their doctrines. He is received as a brother, ſumptuouſly treated, and entruſted with information, of which he gives the following account:

"For three months," ſays he, "I was among them, well "fed, ſplendidly and voluptuouſly feaſted; learning each "day ſome new error or rather horror againſt faith, to all "which I pretended to aſſent. *By dint of good treatment they "obliged me to promiſe, that in future, whenever I was in com-"pany with Chriſtians*, I would do my utmoſt to prove that the "faith of Peter never ſaved any body. *As ſoon as they had "wreſted from me this oath*, they began to diſcover their ſe-"crets to me. They told me, among other things, that from "ſeveral towns in Tuſcany and from almoſt all the towns in "Lombardy, they carefully ſent ſome of their moſt docile "diſciples to Paris, who were there to apply to all the ſub-"tilties of Logic and intricate queſtions of Divinity, in order "to prepare them for maintaining their own errors and com-"bating the Apoſtolic Faith. That beſide this they had a "great number of merchants whom they ſent to the different "fairs with a view of perverting the richer laity, and in a "word all thoſe with whom they converſed or aſſociated at "table. Thus by the extent of their commerce they on one "hand enrich themſelves by other men's money, and on the "other pervert ſouls."

This, beyond a doubt, is a ſecret ſociety, a perfect Propaganda. When we reflect that this ſociety was entirely compoſed of Manichæans, teaching that all men were free and

The Lodge eſtabliſhed at Paris, Rue Coq-heron, and preſided over by the Duke de la Rochefoucault, was more particularly frequented by the profound Maſons. After the *Grand Orient*, this was the Lodge wherein the deepeſt plots were contrived, where Syeyes and Condorcet, with the moſt zealous of the brethren, held their meetings. This was alſo the hotbed whence ſprung the Propaganda. Of all the writers who have treated of this eſtabliſhment, none were better acquainted with it than Mr. Girtanner, who lived at Paris in

equal, and were to obey neither *the ſpiritual nor temporal power*, one can hardly view them in any other light than as Jacobin Maſons. Still leſs can we miſtake them when we obſerve the new adept travelling from Come to Milan, to Cremona, to Venice, and even to Vienna, always received and feaſted by the brethren, only making himſelf known and getting himſelf acknowledged by *means of certain ſigns which were always ſecretly given to him*, Semper in receſſu accepi ab aliis ad alios inter ſigna. *(Math. Paris Hiſt. Ang. ann.* 1243).

It is true, that this is a letter written by a penitent adept, who is ſorry for having ſwerved from the true faith, lamenting the horrors he had been guilty of with the other brethren, and only conſoling himſelf with the happy recollection of having reclaimed ſeveral from their errors, and craving pardon and penance for his paſt wickedneſs. But theſe circumſtances all become new proofs of his ſincerity, and only depict in ſtronger colours the connection between the ſecret aſſociations of the children of Manes, the true Jacobins of the middle age, and the ſecret aſſociations of the Occult Maſons, or of our modern Jacobins.

the

the midſt of the Sophiſters and Maſons. He afterwards lived with the Jacobins, and pryed into every thing with the eye of a correct obſerver. A learned Foreigner and a Phyſician were qualities which rendered him leſs ſuſpicious, and he was much in their confidence. What we are about to lay before our readers concerning the Propaganda is nearly all extracted from his Memoirs on the French Revolution.

" The Club of the Propagandiſts is widely dif-
" ferent from that of the Jacobins, though both
" frequently unite. That of the Jacobins is the
" grand mover of the National Aſſembly; that
" of the Propaganda aims at nothing leſs than be-
" ing the mover of all human nature. This latter
" was in exiſtence as early as the year 1786. The
" Chiefs are the Duc de la Rochefoucault, Con-
" dorcet, and Syeyes."

For the honour of this unfortunate Duke, we haſten to ſay, that the Revolutions ſoon reclaimed him from his errors. He had made himſelf Grand Maſter of ſeveral Lodges, and was the tool of Syeyes and Condorcet, who made uſe of his riches to forward their plans. When he beheld the diſorganization of France ſucceeding to the firſt Conſtitutionaliſts, his zeal for the Propaganda was greatly abated. He at length abandoned it, and Condorcet and Syeyes remained the ſole Chiefs.

"The grand object of the Propagandiſt's Club," ſays Girtanner, "is, to eſtabliſh a philoſophical "order of things, paramount to all the received "opinions of human nature. To be admitted "into this ſociety it is neceſſary to be a ſtickler "for the Modern Philoſophy, that is to ſay, "Dogmatic Atheiſm; or elſe to be ambitious, or "diſcontent with the preſent Government. The "firſt requiſite on your initiation is, a promiſe of "the moſt profound ſecrecy. The candidate is "then informed, that the number of adepts is "immenſe, and that they are ſpread all over the "world. That all are perpetually in queſt of falſe "brethren to make away with them, and to re-"venge themſelves on any who ſhould betray "their ſecret. The candidate then promiſes to "keep no ſecret from the brethren, but always to "defend the people againſt the Government; to "oppoſe all arbitrary orders, and to do all in his "power to introduce a general toleration of reli-"gions.

"This aſſociation is compoſed of two ſorts of "members, thoſe who pay and thoſe who do not. "The firſt claſs ſubſcribe at leaſt three Louis a "year, and the rich double the ſum. The ſub-"ſcribers are about five thouſand; all the reſt "engage to propagate the principles of the ſo-"ciety, and to act according to its views. Theſe "latter may be fifty thouſand.

"In

" In 1790, the general fund of the order " amounted to twenty millions of livres (900,000l.) " in ſpecie; and according to ſtatements made, " there were to be ten millions more before the " end of 1791.

" They have two degrees, that of *candidate* and " that of *initiated*. Their whole doctrine reſts on " the following baſis, *want and opinion are the two* " *agents which make all men act. Cauſe the want,* " *govern opinions,* and you will overturn all the " exiſting ſyſtems, however well conſolidated they " may appear.

" They will alſo add, it is impoſſible to deny " that the oppreſſion under which men live is " moſt frightfully barbarous. It is incumbent on " the lights of philoſophy to quicken the minds " of men, and to ſpread the alarm againſt oppreſ- " ſors. That once done, it will need only to wait " the favorable moment when all minds will be " diſpoſed to embrace the new ſyſtems, which " muſt be preached throughout all Europe at the " ſame time. If any opponents obſtruct the way, " let them be gained by *conviction* or by *want*. If " they perſiſt in their oppoſition, treat them like " Jews, and refuſe them every where the rights " of Citizens."

A very curious article in their code, and which ſhould not be overlooked (as being probably ſuggeſted by the little ſucceſs they obtained at the

outſet), is that which inſtructs the brethren not to try their plan until they are certain of having *created want*. It alſo ſays, that it would be better to defer the ſcheme for fifty years than fail in it through too much precipitation.

"The Propaganda found much difficulty in "gaining footing in Holland; and it only ſuc- "ceeded at laſt by perſuading the people there "that they muſt be led away by the general tor- "rent.—At preſent it draws large ſums of money "from all thoſe provinces for the general fund *."

Such is the account given by Mr. Girtanner as early as the month of February 1791. A letter, dated Paris, September 1, 1792, confirms them all, ſaying, "You may reſt aſſured, that all that "I wrote to you concerning the Propaganda is "perfectly exact. At moſt there are but a few "ſlight errors in the figures, as in the round num- "bers, which muſt be taken as aproximations. "*The Propaganda is at preſent in full activity.* You "WILL SOON PERCEIVE ITS EFFECTS."

At the very period when Mr. Girtanner was writing this, it is eaſy to perceive to what extent they flattered themſelves with ſucceſs. The orator of the club eſtabliſhed at Bruxelles under the name of THE FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE had already exclaimed:

* See Girtanner, Vol. III. in German, from page 470 to 474.

"Every

" Every where fetters are forged for the peo-
" ple ; but Philoſophy and Reaſon ſhall have their
" turn ; and the day ſhall come when the Supreme
" and Sovereign Lord of the Ottoman Empire
" ſhall lie down to reſt a Deſpot, and find himſelf
" on waking a ſimple Citizen *."

As

* Ibid.——It is worthy the attention of every Engliſhman, that the work on the Rights of Man, which appeared under the name of Thomas Paine, was publiſhed as early as the year 1791 ; that it was profuſely ſpread all over Great Britain and Ireland (in the latter of which places it may be ſaid to have been the forerunner of the unhappy broils we have ſince witneſſed), and it was ſold (as I am credibly informed) as low as for 3d. or 4d. to the Iriſh Peaſantry. We ſhould ſwell this note to a volume were we to enumerate the miſerable or rather the abominable penny publications that prove the almoſt *licentious* liberty of the preſs, and that have been and continue to be ſold of late. Even Newſpapers have taken up the taſk. The GAZETEER at this moment comes to hand (Saturday the 16th September 1797), in the third page and fourth column, &c. of which) I read in large letters, " We live in an age preg-
" nant with the ſeeds of deſtruction *to one claſs of men*, and with
" the means of triumph to another. The energies of men are
" all actuated, they are embattled againſt ERROR *and Su-*
" *perſtition, along with its hideous train of Mitres, Dia-*
" *dems, and Sceptres is* DESTINED TO VANISH, overwhelm-
" ed and exploded by the intrepid reaſonings of all good,
" virtuous, independent friends." The writer then talks of *Scourges of Induſtry* and of friends of man ; but, alluding to the French Revolution of the 4th of September, he continues : Theſe " events will be found to be highly conducive to the
" promotion and the final ſucceſs of *thoſe ſchemes which have*

As a corroborative proof, let the reader recall to his mind what I ſaid concerning that adept who was for a long time an unheeding Maſon; was only initiated in the laſt myſteries when, on his reception to the degree of *Kadoſch*, he was judged a proper perſon to be admitted into the Propaganda; and who had it left to his choice to go to London, Bruxelles, or even to Conſtantinople, and, pro-

" *been conceived and arranged in the retreats ſacred to Philoſophy,*
" and to the deſcription we thus allude to. *The* PROJECT
" *is the* EMANCIPATION *of a world.*"

In the next column we find, that mankind are not only indebted to them (the French Government) for Liberty; but " they owe it to them, that the horrible reign of Prieſt-craft " and MONARCHIC INSTITUTIONS have not been reſtored " in one country and eſtabliſhed for centuries in every quarter " of the globe. To them we owe the renewed guarantees of " *ultimate victory in the ſtruggle* TO PULL DOWN AND DE- " STROY THRONES. To them ENGLISHMEN CAN ONLY " LOOK WITH CONFIDENCE *for a redreſs of thoſe grievances* " *which have been* GENERATED IN THE LAP OF MO- " NARCHY, and nouriſhed and foſtered from the cradle, to " a ſtate of manhood by wicked Miniſters, and *the ſycophant* " *eulogiſts* OF A WORTHLESS COURT. *From them, Europe* " *is yet deſtined to receive the* PALM OF LIBERTY, &c. &c. " Glorious events! and glorious times, in which men live " *only to witneſs the downfal of ſome pretender* at (probably miſ- " printed for *as*) *the prelude to* THE OVERTHROW OF SOME " THRONE."—Such are the doctrines forced upon that part of the public who ſupport this Paper. They need no comment, but are ſuch as ſhould rouſe the attention of every Engliſhman to oppoſe them. T.

vided

vided he would but propagate the principles of the French Revolution, was certain of repairing from the fund of the brotherhood the loſs that his fortune had ſuſtained.

It is thus that many new degrees had been added to Maſonry, and even a new ſociety, which the reſtleſs enthuſiaſm of the Sophiſters of Impiety had invented to ſpread the ancient ſyſtems of diſorganizing Liberty and Equality, and to enſure their triumph. It was to the Propaganda that they were indebted for the immenſe number of their adepts; or rather, in rendering impiety ſo common, the ſpirit of Philoſophiſm had gained ſo much ground, that it was ſcarcely neceſſary to be initiated into the Occult myſteries to be a complete conſpirator.

At that time few novices were to be found either in the Grand Lodges of the *Orient* or of the *Contrat Social.* The Revolution was ſo openly carried on there, that the Court could not be ignorant of it. Among the number, it was impoſſible that ſome ſhould not look upon the Revolution as a moſt dreadful ſcourge, and in reality ſeveral were of this opinion. With certainty I may number among theſe latter the French Nobleman who received the letter mentioned before, from Alfonſe Le Roi,

Being

The Court and Lewis XVI. informed of the Conſpiracy, but to no purpoſe.

Being queſtioned, whether he had not obſerved ſomething among the Maſons tending towards the French Revolution, he made the following reply: "I have been the orator in many Lodges, and "had got to a pretty high degree. As yet, how-"ever, I had obſerved nothing which in my opi-"nion could threaten the ſtate. I had not at-"tended for a long time, when in 1786 I was "met in Paris by one of the brethren, who re-"proached me for having abandoned the aſſo-"ciation; he preſſed me to return, and particu-"larly to attend a meeting which he told me "would be very intereſting. I agreed to attend "on the day mentioned, and was extremely well "received. I heard things which I cannot tell "you; but they were of ſuch a nature, that, full "of indignation, I went immediately to the Mi-"niſter. I ſaid to him, *Sir, I am not entitled to "queſtion you; I am aware of the importance and "of the conſequences which may reſult from my in-"truſion; but were I to be ſent to the Baſtille, I "muſt aſk you (becauſe I believe the ſafety of the "King and of the State is at ſtake), whether the "Freemaſons are watched, and whether you are ac-"quainted with what is contriving in their Lodges?* "The Miniſter turned upon his heel, and an-"ſwered, *Make yourſelf eaſy, Sir, you ſhall not go "to the Baſtille, nor will the Freemaſons trouble the "State.*"

This

This Miniſter was not a man who could be ſuſpected of having in any degree tampered in the Revolution; but he moſt certainly thought it chimerical even to ſurmiſe a plan of overthrowing monarchy, and concluded, like the *Comte de Vergennes*, that, while he had the control of an army of two hundred thouſand men, a revolution was little to be feared.

Lewis XVI. was himſelf warned of the dangers which threatened his throne, but continued in that ſecurity which only ceaſed to delude him on his return from Varennes, when he ſaid to a perſon in whom he confided, *Why did I not believe, eleven years ſince, what I ſo clearly ſee to-day! for I had been warned of it ſo long ago as that.*

If any one was entitled to diſbelieve plots formed againſt his perſon or his throne, it was certainly the unfortunate Lewis XVI. Seeking only the happineſs of his ſubjects in all the ſincerity of his heart, never having committed a ſingle act of injuſtice, perpetually ſacrificing his own intereſt to that of his people, and ambitious of nothing ſo much as of the love of that ſame people, how was it poſſible for him to conceive that the conſpirators could ſucceed in repreſenting him as a tyrant? Lewis XVI. had not one of thoſe vices which draw down hatred on the Monarch's head. Publicly proclaimed the juſteſt of Princes, and the moſt honeſt man of his empire, he was unfortunately the weakeſt of Kings—

But

But if ever Miniſters prepared a Revolution, it was certainly thoſe in whom he placed his confidence. He began by entruſting himſelf to *Mr. De Maurepas*, whoſe inactive and careleſs diſpoſition, dreading nothing ſo much as violent ſhocks or tempeſtuous broils, quietly permitted all thoſe to gather which were only to burſt forth when he was gone. The Sophiſter *Turgot* appeared but for a moment, as it were to make an eſſay of thoſe ſyſtems which ſilently ſapped the throne. The ſordid œconomy of *Mr. de St. Germain* only ſerved to deprive the Monarch of his braveſt ſupporters. The quack *Necker* ſhowed no talent but that of ruining the public treaſury with his loans, and of accuſing *Mr. de Calonne's* profuſion of the fact. Under Mr. de Vergennes, falſe policy fomented external Revolutions, but to infuſe the ſpirit for, and prepare interior ones. Greedy courtiers diſguſt the Monarch with their intrigues, alienate the people by their ſcandals, corrupt them by their impiety, and irritate them by their luxury. The aſſembly of the *Notables* convene with the apparent intention only of repairing great errors, at the ſole expence of the Nobility and Clergy; and nothing guaranteed that great ſacrifices would not prove a great ſource for new dilapidations. New diſſentions threatened to break out between the King and the High Courts of Judicature, when Brienne was on the eve of making his appearance

to

to complete the ruin by turning on the Monarch all that contempt and hatred which ſhould juſtly have been heaped upon himſelf. Not a ſingle miniſter attempted to brook the torrent of Rebellion and Impiety; not one reflected on the inefficacy of the laws for a people who hated their chiefs, and had loſt all tie of religion. The Sophiſters of Holbach's club, thoſe of Maſonry, and all the male-contents of all claſſes, whether noble or plebeian, had but little to do to create the deſire of a Revolution; and that was the period which our conſpirators waited for to conſummate their plots; that was what the Propagandiſts called *creating want*. Every thing denoted that the time was come, and they applied themſelves to muſter up their forces for the completion of the cataſtrophe.

Friends of the Blacks.

In the year 1787, about the ſame time that Mr. de Calonne, anxious to retrieve the finances from the diſorder into which Necker had thrown them, was convening the *Notables*, a ſecret aſſociation, ſuppoſed of new invention, eſtabliſhed itſelf at the *Hotel de Luſſan* in the ſtreet *Croix des Petits Champs*, under the name of *Amis des Noirs* (Friends of the Blacks). There was nothing new in this aſſociation but the name. All ſectaries of Liberty, whether ancient or modern, every claſs of Sophiſters, and all the Revolutionary Maſons, had adopted this appellation only the better to conceal the grand object of their Conſpiracy under the

the ſpecious pretext of humanity. While occupying all Europe with the queſtion they had propoſed, on the ſlavery of the Negroes in America, they never loſt ſight of that Revolution which they had ſo long meditated, and which was to liberate all Europe from the pretended ſlavery of the laws and of ſuppoſed tyrants. Their Lodges might become ſuſpicious by their daily meetings, and they wiſhed not to loſe ſight for a ſingle hour of the grand object of their plots. The adepts did not agree as to the *method* of the Revolution, or as to the laws to be ſubſtituted to thoſe of the Monarchy. All however were unanimous on *Equality and Liberty*, the grand ſecret of their myſteries. They alſo agreed, that both Liberty and Equality were at an end, wherever the people were not ſovereign, and did not make their own laws, wherever they could not revoke and change them at pleaſure, and particularly where the people were ſubjected to a Monarch or Magiſtrates who governed in their own right, or who were not the agents and the executors of their will, and ſubject to be recalled whenever it might pleaſe the people. But among the adepts were many Sophiſters who ſhaped out *Liberty and Equality* according to their own intereſts, their diſpoſitions, their rank and their fortunes. They were in ſome ſort the Ariſtocratic Jacobins. The adept Counts, Marquiſſes, Dukes, Knights, and wealthy Citizens,

zens, all theſe were perfectly of opinion, that they were to loſe nothing of their rank or fortune in this new ſyſtem of Equality, but that, on the contrary, they were to ſhare among them all the rights, authority, and influence which they were to wreſt from their unfortunate Monarch. In a word, they wiſhed for ſuch a King as the firſt Jacobin Legiſlators dreamt of, a King whom they could domineer over, and who had no authority over them. Others wiſhed for an Equality of Liberty in the grandees or wealthy, counterpoiſed by an Equality of Liberty in the plebeians, and concentrating in a common chief the King. This was the Equality of the *Monarchiſts*, who thought themſelves guiltleſs rebels becauſe they were not ſufficiently powerful to direct the courſe of the rebellion. As for the laſt claſs, they wiſhed neither for a conſtitutional nor any other King. With them every King was a Tyrant, and every tyrant was to be overthrown; all Ariſtocracy was to be exploded; all titles, rank, or power was to be levelled; and this laſt claſs alone was initiated in the profound ſecrets of the Revolution. They conceived that they could only proceed by degrees; that it was neceſſary to unite in order to compaſs the overthrow of the exiſting order of things; and, that accompliſhed, to wait the favourable moment for accompliſhing their ultimate deſigns.

It

It was in this view that Briſſot, Condorcet, and Syeyes propoſed to form a general union of all the adepts, whatever might be their Revolutionary Syſtems, under the title of *Friends of the Blacks*, it was even agreed, that every man who had any ſerious cauſe of complaint againſt the court ſhould be invited to join them. This was the reaſon why they invited the *Marquis de Beaupoil de St. Aulaire*, whom they ſuppoſed to be imbued with their principles through deſire of revenge. But they were groſsly miſtaken. The Marquis had great reaſon to complain of the Miniſtry; but no one could better diſtinguiſh the cauſe of the Monarch from the injuſtice of his Miniſters.

This however proved a fortunate error for hiſtory. What I am about to preſent to the reader concerning this aſſociation is made public by permiſſion of Mr. de Beaupoil. He was kind (and I will ſay patriotic) enough to favor me with an account of what he had been eye-witneſs to in that ſecret ſociety; and in vain would the hiſtorian ſeek a better authority.

Conſonant to the wiſhes of its projectors, the aſſociation of the *Friends of the Blacks* was compoſed of all the adepts who had imbibed the principles of modern Philoſophiſm, and they were generally initiated in the myſteries of Freemaſonry. In the multitude of brethren were many thouſands of dupes, all ardent for, all ready to ſecond the Revo-

Revolution, and all promoting it with their utmoſt exertions. Each member ſubſcribed two guineas, and was entitled to attend the deliberations. That the plans might be better digeſted, a *regulating committee* was formed of the following perſons, viz. Condorcet, Mirabeau the elder, Syeyes, Briſſot, Carra, the Duc de la Rochefoucault, Clavieres, Pelletier de St. Fargeau, Valadi, La Fayette, and ſome others.

Had I not even mentioned the French Revolution, this liſt of its prime movers muſt naturally make it occur. And what could be the object of ſuch a ſociety, which begins by giving itſelf a *regulating committee* compoſed preciſely of all thoſe men who, in the courſe of the revolution, have ſhewn themſelves its greateſt abettors? A Condorcet, who would have ſmiled at the conflagration of the univerſe, provided neither Prieſt nor King could ſpring from its aſhes *! A Mirabeau, who to the impiety, the ambition, and all the other crimes of a Catiline, had nothing of his own to add but cowardice, and ſtill retained all the daring profligacy of his patron †.

Conſpirators under the name of *Friends of the Blacks.*

When the hiſtorian ſhall depict a Syeyes, let him begin with the viſage of a ſnake; for it is

* He murdered himſelf. T.

† Died in great agonies of pain, 3d April 1791, ſuppoſed to have been poiſoned by the Jacobins. T.

ſolely to the art of hiding his venom that that abominable character is indebted for his reputation of a profound genius. Like Mirabeau, he had long ſtudied the Revolutionary arts; he left to the latter the more ſtriking features of crime, reſerving to himſelf thoſe luxuries of obſcure criminals, who point out to the ruffians the crimes to be committed, and then ſculk behind their blood-thirſty cohorts *.

With all the deſire of operating a Philoſophical Revolution, and of conducting it with profound policy, Briſſot only dared appear on the ſecond rank: But he had already formed the plan of his Republic, and his Philoſophiſm only ſhrunk from the horrors of the Revolution, when the axe, with which he had himſelf aſſailed the throne, was ſuſpended over his own head †.

Claviere, a greedy and frigid ſtock-jobber, comes from Necker's own country to ſell to the Pariſians the Revolutionary arts which he had practiſed there. Moderate in his expreſſions, even when he inſinuated the moſt treacherous and ferocious means, he ſeemed to have ſecretly watched Syeyes to learn the art of forming diſciples ‡.

* Still exiſts, 20th September, 1797. T.
† Was guillotined 31ſt of October 1793. T.
‡ Murdered himſelf the 1ſt of December 1793. T.

After

After having kiſſed the gallows, Carra appears to revenge himſelf on thoſe laws which had not puniſhed him for his thefts, and he ſeems to enjoy the liberty to which he is reſtored only to blaſpheme like a demoniac both God and King *.

He that is ignorant of the effect of flattery on a weak mind, will be ſurpriſed to ſee the name of Rochefoucault among beings of this ſpecies. Condorcet wanted a tool; as long as he could direct this unfortunate Duke he led him every where, to the Lodges, to the Clubs, to the National Aſſembly; he even perſuaded him that he was leading him through the paths of virtue and honour †.

As to La Fayette, on his white horſe at the head of the Revolutionary bands, he thought himſelf the favorite child of Mars; ſeated near the Sophiſters, he believed himſelf a Philoſopher; and, the Hero of the Fiſh-market, he affects to rival Waſhington. Happy for him if his misfortunes have inſpired him with a due ſenſe of ſhame and ſorrow for having been ſo long a time the puppet of the Sophiſters and incendiary firebrands.

* Guillotined the 31ſt of October 1793. T.

† When he could lead him no longer he ſent aſſaſſins to murder the Duke, who was torn to pieces by the mob, September 2, 1792. T.

Laſtly, the Advocate Bergaſſe was called to this regulating committee. This man had neither the folly of La Fayette nor the wickedneſs of Condorcet, but he believed in Revolutionary Liberty and Equality as he did in the *Somnambules*, who had perſuaded him that he was their Meſſiah. He even expected to act the part. When, in the firſt days of that Aſſembly which was called National, he was entruſted with the care of framing the code of Liberty and Equality, he was quite ſurprized to find himſelf coupled with Mounier and ſeveral other co-deputies. He meant alone to reſtore the people to Liberty and Equality, and to triumph over Deſpotiſm. It was not the ſuperiority of talents nor his high repute for honeſty that acquired him his ſeat in this committee, but the wild enthuſiaſm of his ideas and his thirſt after a new order of things. Happily for him, what made him quit the new Legiſlators, made him alſo abandon the Conſpirators. His receſſion only left Condorcet, Syeyes, Mirabeau, and the other rebels, more at liberty to act.

When the Marquis de Beaupoil was invited to inſcribe his name on the liſt of this aſſociation, he candidly believed that its object was the conſideration of thoſe queſtions, ſo worthy a generous ſoul, on the means to be propoſed to the King of alleviating or perhaps aboliſhing the ſlavery of the Negroes. He did not however remain long in his

his error. The eſtabliſhment of Liberty and Equality, and the compiling of the Rights of Man, were the leading features of all their deliberations, and conſequences of the moſt alarming nature to Sovereigns were drawn and debated without the leaſt heſitation.

Object of their committee.

" Notwithſtanding my profeſſed averſion for " ſuch opinions," ſays the Marquis, " I had the " conſtancy to attend the meetings of the regu- " lating committee till I was perfectly maſter of " their plans. I remarked that all the members " of the aſſociation were alſo members of the Ma- " ſonic Lodges, and particularly of that ſociety " actuated by the ſame principles called *Philan-* " *tropes*. I alſo obſerved that there already exiſt- " ed a cloſe correſpondence with the other aſſo- " ciations of the ſame ſort both in Europe and " America, and the general talk was on the cer- " tainty of a Revolution which was nigh at hand. " Thoſe brethren who did not belong to the com- " mittee came to bring their money, and repeat " their moſt ardent wiſhes for the ſucceſs of its " arduous undertakings. They then mixed in the " different Lodges and Clubs, which in fact pro- " feſſed the ſame principles, and the regulating " committee primed over theſe various Clubs, " only becauſe it was compoſed of the moſt wicked " members from each.

" Their grand object known, I might have " pryed into their moſt ſecret myſteries; but I " diſdained diſſimulation; and had I remained " longer in this haunt of Conſpirators I muſt have " adopted it. Full of indignation, I declaimed " vehemently againſt their plots; I required that " my name ſhould be erazed from the liſt; I " blotted it out myſelf, and left their den for " ever.

" I ought certainly to have haſtened to inform " Government of the doctrines and plans of this " Aſſociation *; but to denounce a ſociety which " had admitted me to its myſteries, bears a face " of perfidy which I ſhould have rejected had it " occurred. I confined myſelf therefore to print- " ing a ſort of antidote under the title of *Unity of* " *the Monarchical power*. Some time after that, " I printed a work called *Of the Republic and of the* " *Monarchy*, with a view to warn the King, and " the nation at large, of the conſequences pending " on the Revolution. This was more than ne- " ceſſary to expoſe me to all the vengeance of " the Conſpirators. I was acquainted that the " very day after my erazure, the whole ſitting was " ſpent in ſuggeſting means of puniſhing what " they called my treachery; many violent opi-

* This is a moſt awful example of the fatal conſequences of oaths of ſecrecy. T.

" nions

" nions were broached; but Mirabeau only voted " for calumny and other means of repreſenting me " as a dangerous man, and one to whom no credit " was due. Carra and Gorſas were entruſted with " the commiſſion, and it was from their pens that " flowed the moſt violent declamations againſt " me; and when the proſcriptions began my " name was to be found foremoſt upon the liſt."

If the candour and loyalty of the Marquis hindered him from ſtaying any longer among theſe Conſpirators, his account at leaſt demonſtrates that he had remained long enough to remove all doubt as to the grand object of their myſteries. I really believe myſelf entitled to announce to the public, that a day will come when even all the moſt ſecret deliberations of this den of Conſpirators will be made public.

When the Revolution rendered it unneceſſary for the prime agents to wear the maſk any longer, the name of *Friends of the Blacks* was thrown aſide and the aſſociation appeared to be diſſolved. *The regulating committee* remained, and only enveloped itſelf in greater darkneſs the more ſurely to direct all the Pariſian Clubs, the Sections, the Revolutionary Societies, and even the Jacobins themſelves. If Gobet*, the too famous intruded Archbiſhop of Paris,

I may now declare it, ſince this unhappy Gobet has fallen a victim to his vain terrors and mean apoſtaſy. It was he

Paris, was not a member of this committee he knew their plans; he muſt even have been preſent at their meetings more than once. He would not otherwiſe have ſpoken ſo emphatically of what was contriving there at the time this unhappy apoſtate requeſted ſome ſecret conferences with me, concerning his reconciliation with the church. I am at preſent perfectly perſuaded, that it was the fear of the regulating committee which hindered him from keeping his word, and in ſome ſort atoning for the horrible ſcandal he had given. It is true, that he never ſpoke to me of the committee but in general terms, yet it was always with ſo much terror that I could eaſily ſurmiſe the atrocity of their plans: "No," ſaid he, "no, you cannot con-" ceive you could not give credit to the lengths

whom I would not name when ſpeaking (in my *Hiſtory of the French Clergy during the Revolution)* of the Conſtitutional Biſhops that wiſhed to retract. Gobet was at their head. He requeſted ſeveral conferences with me, and we had three, which laſted two hours each. Every thing was prepared. Rome had anſwered with all the tenderneſs imaginable to Gobet's promiſes. His retractation was compriſed in ſix letters, which were already written and directed to the Pope, the King, the Archbiſhops, the Clergy, the Department, and the Municipality of Paris. But the unfortunate man wiſhed firſt to quit France, to be out of the reach of the Jacobins. The report of his departure was whiſpered about, he was frightened, he remained, and Robeſpierre ordered him to be guillotined on the 9th of April 1794.

" they

" they mean to go, what plans, what means they " have in agitation. You have ſeen nothing as " yet." We were, nevertheleſs, in April of the third year of the Revolution, and I had witneſſed many horrid ſcenes.

Long before this period I was acquainted with an adept, a great Maſon and Deiſt, but an enemy to carnage and plunder. He wiſhed for a *Philoſophical Revolution* conducted with more order and leſs violence, and was a member of the regulating committee. I ſhall never forget what he told me one day, when ſpeaking of the committee in nearly the ſame terms as Gobet had done. I could have foretold all that has ſince been done againſt the Nobility, the Clergy, and the King. " I go " there," ſaid he, " but with horror, and to op- " poſe their frightful projects. Hereafter ſhall be " known all that is carried on there, and how " thoſe ſavage minds add to the horrors of the " Revolution. It ſhall be known, but after my " death. I am too wiſe to publiſh it during my " life. I know too well what they are."

I will not attempt to ſupply from my imagination what might be ſurmiſed from ſuch a ſpeech, reſpecting a committee entirely compoſed of the moſt inveterate enemies of the altar and of the throne which Maſonry or the Sophiſters could produce. But I will lay before my readers what I have learned from various adepts concerning that part

part of the Conſpiracy to which this volume has naturally led us.

Correſpondences of the committee.

Of all the means adopted by the regulating committee, that which contributed the moſt to form the immenſe multitude of armed men which they wanted, was their correſpondence with the Maſonic Lodges diſperſed at that time all over France in great numbers. In Paris alone there were one hundred and fifty, and as many in proportion, if not more, in the other towns and even in the villages.

Deliberations taken at the *regulating committee* were tranſmitted to the *central committee of the Grand Orient*; thence they were ſent to the *Venerables* or Maſters of the different Lodges in the provinces. The very year in which this regulating committee was eſtabliſhed a great many of the *Venerables* received inſtructions accompanied by the following letter: "As ſoon as you ſhall receive "the encloſed packet you will acknowledge the "receipt of it. You will ſubjoin the oath of "punctually and faithfully executing all orders "which you ſhall receive in the ſame form, with-"out making any inquiry whence they come or "by whom they ſhall be ſent. If you refuſe this "oath, or if you are not true to it, you will be "looked upon as having violated the oath * which "you

* This is another example of the fatal conſequences of binding oneſelf by oaths of the tendency of which we are ignorant.

" you took at your initiation. Remember the " *Æqua Tophana* (the moſt ſubtle of poiſons). " Remember the *poniards* that will ſtart from their " ſheaths to pierce the heart of a traitor."

Such nearly were the contents of a letter received by a man formerly a moſt zealous Maſon, and of whom I learned that ſimilar orders had been ſent to the other Maſters of Lodges. For nearly theſe two years paſt I have been in poſſeſſion of a memorial which names ſeveral of the *Venerables* who received theſe inſtructions and faithfully complied with them. Such was the conduct of La Coſte, a Phyſician of Montignac-le-Comte, in Perigord, originally the founder of the Lodge in that town, a Deputy at the ſecond Aſſembly, and finally voting the King's death in the third. I can alſo name the Attorney Gairaux, who did not ſhow leſs zeal for the Revolution. He was not the Maſter of the Lodge when theſe firſt inſtructions were ſent. The packet was delivered to the Chev.

norant. It may alſo ſerve to explain the queſtion before noticed in page 284, as being put at the initiation of the Fellow-craft to the degree of Maſter: *Brother, are you diſpoſed to execute all the orders of the Grand Maſter, though you were to receive contrary orders from a King, an Emperor, or any other Sovereign whatever?*—The danger of ſuch oaths will receive a ſtill ſtronger demonſtration in the Third Part of this Work, when we come to treat of the dark and iniquitous Cabals and menacing Conſpiracies of the *Illuminés*. T.

de

de la Calprade, at that time intruſted with the hammer at the Lodge at Sarlat; but, ſurmiſing to what lengths theſe firſt letters might lead him, he very providently reſigned his place to Gairaux*.

I am thus minute in my accounts, becauſe it is eſſential that hiſtory be informed how ſo deep a plot was carried on, and how thoſe millions of armed men appeared to ſecond it at the ſame inſtant in every part of France.

Farther extenſion of Freemaſonry.

Leſt their numbers ſhould not be ſufficiently great, *the regulating Committee* reſolved on admitting a claſs of men, which had long ſince been excluded, to the leſſer myſteries of Maſonry. It was that of the day labourers, and all the lower claſſes of mechanics, even vagabonds and ruffians. —With theſe men *Liberty and Equality* needed no farther explanation. It was eaſy for the adepts to infuſe the revolutionary enthuſiaſm into them by the power of theſe words alone.

* I was in poſſeſſion of another memorial which I am ſorry to ſay has been miſlaid. It was the account of a gentleman, who, having refuſed to continue the correſpondence with the Maſonic Central Committee, was puniſhed for it by him to whom he delivered it over. At the firſt dawn of the Revolution he was thrown into priſon as an Ariſtocrate. Orders were ſent for his delivery. The maſter, now become a Municipal Officer, changed the order for that of letting him walk upon a very high terrace. At the ſame time orders were given to the ſentry to throw him off it, and theſe latter orders were executed. He did not die however of the fall, and I believe he is at preſent living in Spain.

The

The Maſons of a higher rank in Paris did not like to fraternize with ſuch brethren. It was neceſſary to call ſome from the Provinces, and in a ſhort time the ſuburbs of *St. Antoine* and *St. Marceau* were entirely Maſonized.

Strength and numbers of the Freemaſons.

Many years before the formation of this Regulating Committee, the well-informed adepts would write that the number of Freemaſons was *incomparably* greater in France than in England; that the hair-dreſſers and valets, and every ſort of profeſſion flocked to the Lodges *. It will not be an exaggeration therefore to calculate the number of Freemaſons at ſix hundred thouſand; and at that period it could not be ſuppoſed that the generality of this immenſe number were averſe to the plans of the Occult Lodges. Impiety and the declamations of the Sophiſters ſupplied the laſt myſteries. The greateſt novices were enthuſiaſtically wedded to the ideas of Liberty and Equality. Let a hundred thouſand of the brethren be ſubtracted as untainted with theſe principles, it will be the moſt the hiſtorian can do in favour of our youth who remained faithful to the ſpirit of their forefathers. Thus the *Regulating Club* could rely upon the ſupport of five hundred thouſand brethren, at that time ſpread all over France, all zealous for the

* Uber die Alten and Newen Myſterien bey Frederich Maurer, 1782.

Revolution,

Revolution, all ready to riſe at the firſt ſignal and to impart the ſhock to all other claſſes of the people. The Sophiſters already boaſted that it was not ſuch an eaſy thing to triumph over three millions of men.

This was the plan adopted by the Committee to organize the Revolutionary bands. The Sophiſters had cleared the way by perverting the public opinion. The hiding places and dens of a ſect, the ſworn enemies to Chriſtianity and Sovereigns, had opened and expanded themſelves. The adepts of Occult Maſonry had multiplied; their ancient tenets of Impiety and Rebellion had identified them in the new Lodges with that of modern Philoſophiſm. Opinion had gained the heart; but plots, cunning, and ſecret artifice, had muſtered up the forces. Had *Necker*, *Briennes*, the *Deficit* or the *Notables* never been mentioned in France, had Lewis XIV. been upon the throne when the *Regulating Committee* and the *Central Club* of Maſonry ſhould have compleated the organization of their ſkulking adherents, Lewis XIV. himſelf would not have ſtopped the Revolution. It would have found chiefs. Public opinion would have named them, and the banners of truth would have been deſerted. At the ſound of *Liberty and Equality* he would have ſeen his legions diſband, and rally under the ſtandard of revolt. Had Lewis XVI. refuſed to convoke the States General, the Regu-

Regulating Committee would have convened them; five hundred thouſand adepts under arms would have ſupported the convocation, and the people would have flocked to the elections.

Philip d'Orleans elected Chief of the Conſpirators.

Such was the progreſs of this twofold Conſpiracy at the time of the convocation of the States General. The ſkulking Sophiſters of Maſonry and the barefaced Sophiſters of Holbach's Club perceived that it would be neceſſary to chooſe a chief who might be made the ſtalking-horſe, and give them a ſanction by his name. He was to be powerful, that he might forward the crimes which they had planned; he was to be cruel, leſt he ſhould flinch at the ſight of the numerous victims that were to be ſacrificed to their horrid plots.—He needed not the talents, but the vices of a Cromwell. The conſpirators ſoon caſt their eyes on *Philip D'Orleans*, the pupil of ſome evil Genius.

D'Orleans, for his part, was conſpiring as well as the combined Sophiſters. More wicked than ambitious, he aſpired at the Throne; but, like the evil genius, he delighted in ruin and devaſtation, even though he ſhould not thereby exalt himſelf: *Philip* had ſworn to ſeat himſelf on the Throne, or to overturn it though he were to be cruſhed under the ruins. For a long time had this unparalleled monſter been callous to honor or remorſe; a brazen front repelled the ſhafts of contempt or of diſdain, nor was he to be affected by the

the hatred of man or of heaven. A youth ſpent in debauchery had deadened every honorable ſentiment of his heart, and by the blackeſt deeds he ſought to enſure his expectations of fortune. At an age when the love of riches is ſcarcely known, public report accuſed him of having enticed the young Prince of Lamballe into debauchery merely to ſecure to himſelf the immenſe fortune of this young Prince, who fell a victim to his cunning, while in queſt of pleaſure. Nor is there an action of his life which could render at all improbable ſuch atrocious perfidy. Time only more and more developed a heart capable of ſuch deſigns; he was cowardly and revengeful; ambitious and cringing; prodigal and avaricious. Proud of his name and the rank of Prince, he was the humble ſervant of the vileſt populace; choleric and impetuous before his friends, cool and diſſembling before thoſe whom he wiſhed to ruin, callous to all good actions if he ſaw no direct means of diverting them to evil purpoſes, and never meditating ſuch dark and hideous plots as when he aſſumed the character of ſenſibility and benevolence. Little capable (from cowardice) of daring crimes, he was wicked enough to dedicate his riches to the completion of them. His heart, in a word, was the common ſewer of every baleful paſſion, and of every vice. He needed but the opportunity to diſcover his

his bias to evil; and ſuch was the chief with which Lucifer preſented the Conſpirators.

During the contentions which ſubſiſted between the Court and the Parliaments *Philip* had leagued with ſeveral of thoſe Magiſtrates who were more worthy of being ſeated in the Regulating Club of the Conſpirators than in the firſt Tribunal of the kingdom. He was much more employed as their tool to inſult the Royal Majeſty in the very ſanctuary of the laws, than as a leader againſt the encroachments of Briennes *.

Lewis XVI. for the firſt time ſhowed his reſentment, and Philip was exiled to Villers-Coterets. This was the ſpark that fired D'Orleans's heart with vengeance. He already hated Lewis XVI. becauſe he was King; he hated Marie Antionette becauſe ſhe was Queen; he ſwore their ruin; he ſwore it in the tranſports of rage and fury; nor did his agitation ceaſe but to leave him at liberty to meditate the means of vengeance. His firſt ſtep was to call to his councils the greateſt villains France could produce. That Laclos whoſe ſable genius ſeemed to riſe from the Stygian Lakes to guide the venemous and tortuous courſe of the blackeſt crimes.

Mirabeau and Syeyes flocked thither, nor was it difficult for them to point out the great helps to

* Hiſtory of the Conſpiracy of the Duke of Orleans.

be acquired from the Maſonic Lodges, of which he had been choſen the honorary chief. The Legions of Hell are bound by the bonds of friendſhip when evil is their object, and the grand plan was combined during the ſhort period that Philip remained in exile. At that time he was initiated n the Occult Myſteries, but not as men of his ank formerly were; for it is certain that the brethren had conſidered him as ſufficiently wicked to be admitted to their deepeſt myſteries. It is certain that the King-killing trial of the Vault in the degree of *Kadoſch* was a voluptuous one for him.—In pronouncing theſe words, *Hatred to all Worſhip, Hatred to all Kings*, he muſt have ſeen all his hopes vaniſh of ſeating himſelf on the throne of the unfortunate Lewis XVI. but he breathed vengeance; and, though he were to expend his life and fortune in the purſuit, he would not relent. He renounces the throne under the penalty of perjury, and was overjoyed at having aſſociated with men who had ſworn to deſtroy all thrones, provided they would firſt ſtrike that of his own relative and King.

This oath diſcovered to him an ocean of crimes, but he did not ſhrink at their ſight; they only ſerved to ſtimulate him to the perpetration of them. Briſſot declared that he ſubſcribed to them all at that period, but that *the Court was too ſtrong as yet*, and that he only retired to England to gain time,

time, and to let the Revolution ripen. The Marquis de Beaúpoil atteſts this fact, in his memorial, as having heard Briſſot himſelf declare it.

The time was not yet come upon which the Regulating Committees had decided. They waited for the States General; their artifices, their clubs, and a cloud of writers had nearly made the demand general. The Parliament of Paris called for them. France looked up to them as the regenerating power; but I have not as yet enumerated all the plots nor all the ſects which clamorouſly called for them to emtomb the Monarchy and all its laws.

In theſe divers plots the Sophiſters of the Encyclopædia, oppoſing the rights of Liberty and Equality to the Altar, had thrown themſelves headlong into the gulph of hatred to Royalty.--- The Tenebrous and Occult Lodges of Maſonry, the antique myſteries of the adopted ſlave, had received the diſciples of Voltaire and Diderot into their boſom, but to connect and more ſecretly invigorate that hatred of Chriſt and of Kings. The Sophiſters of Impiety and of Rebellion had only intermixed their plots with thoſe of the Lodges, or rather dens, ready to caſt forth their Legions of adepts and firebrands enthuſiaſtically armed to eſtabliſh their Liberty and Equality on the ruins of the Altar and the Throne. The frightful Propaganda appeared with its treaſures

and its apoſtles.—The *Central* and the *Regulating Committees* could boaſt of their *Secret Correſpondences*, their council, and their chief—all the forces of Rebellion and of Impiety were organized—ſtill thoſe were not the only ſcourges that were to deſolate France.

Under the name of ILLUMINÉS a band of Conſpirators had coaleſced with the Encyclopediſts and Maſons, far more dangerous in their tenets, more artful in their plots, and more extenſive in their plans of devaſtation. They more ſilently prepared the exploſions of the Revolutionary volcano, not merely ſwearing hatred to the Altar of Chriſt and the Throne of Kings, but ſwearing at once hatred to every God, to every Law, to every Government, to all ſociety and ſocial compact; and in order to deſtroy every plea and every foundation of the ſocial contract, they proſcribed the terms MINE *and* THINE, acknowledging neither Equality nor Liberty but in the *entire, abſolute, and univerſal overthrow of all* PROPERTY *whatever.*

That ſuch a ſect could have exiſted; that it could have acquired power; that it does exiſt; and that it is to this ſect that the moſt terrible ſcourges of the Revolution are to be traced, are without doubt among thoſe extraordinary phenomena, of the reality of which the moſt incontrovertible proofs alone can convince the reader.

Such

Such will be the object of the third Part of theſe Memoirs.

After having ſucceſſively developed the Conſpiracy of the *Sophiſters of Impiety*, that of the *Sophiſters of Rebellion*, and that of the *Sophiſters of Anarchy*, it will be eaſy for us to apply the different diſaſtrous conſequences of each of theſe conſpiring ſects to the French Revolution, and to prove that the Monſter called JACOBIN is no other than the aggregate of the triple conſpiracy and of the triple ſect.

END OF THE SECOND PART.

00094344

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018